National Anti-Slavery Standard.

VOL. XVIII. NO. 17. NEW YORK, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 1857. WHOLE NO. 901.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, ON SATURDAY,

AT TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM,

BY THE

AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,

At its Office, 138 Nassau St., New York,

AND AT THE OFFICE OF THE

PENNSYLVANIA ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,

31 North Fifth St., Philadelphia.

RATE OF ADVERTISING, 10 cents per line each insertion.

NORRIS & JOHNSTON, PRINTERS.

Pro-Slavery.

A TALE OF SORROW.

From The Richmond (Va.) Enquirer.

I GRADUATED at Yale College in 1847; and, in accordance with a time-honoured custom, and one which does honour to human nature, I recently undertook a long and fatiguing journey, with great inconvenience to myself in regard to my pecuniary matters, and when in the enjoyment of but feeble health, from Tennessee to New Haven, there to meet my classmates, after an absence of ten years, and to renew friendships contracted in the spring-time of my life, which can never be effaced from my memory, and which, in my case, are certainly warmer than those contracted at any subsequent period. I have been looking forward to this meeting with pleasing anticipations for years, and had determined, if I possibly could, to be present. Judge, then, of my deep regret, mortification and disgust when, on my arrival at New Haven, I learned that Charles Sumner had been invited to deliver an oration nominally before the Phi Beta Kappa Society, but in reality before the public at large, and that, upon his declension, Wendell Phillips had been invited, and had accepted. I presume there is no doubt that the faculty of Yale could have prevented this, but they not only failed to do that, but, so far as I am aware, never uttered one word in opposition to it. I am informed that it was done principally through the instrumentality of the Rev. Mr. Dutton, pastor of the North Church, rendered famous, both himself and his church, by the Sharp's rifle meeting.

In addition to this, on the night succeeding the day on which Wendell Phillips's oration was delivered, at a class supper partaken of by my class, to which President Woolsey was invited as a special compliment, in consequence of ours being the first which graduated after he was made President, he (President Woolsey) even, on such an occasion as that, could not refrain from expressing his hostility to Southern slavery. He said that although he was a conservative, yet he must acknowledge that he was an anti-slavery man, and that, having been led recently, in the performance of his duties as an instructor, to examine the history of the decline of the Roman Empire, he was satisfied, from the direful effects of slavery he had there seen, that in future he would be more anti-slavery still. Notwithstanding he said that he did not suffer this subject to be introduced in college, yet it seems strange that he could banish it from college and could not keep silent on such an occasion as that, and that, too, when every one seemed desirous of avoiding that and all other subjects that could possibly ruffle the overflowing feelings of joy naturally engendered by the meeting of friends after ten years' absence. Not the slightest allusion to slavery was made, during the whole evening, by any one else. As for myself, I was afraid to mention the subject at all, for fear that I should discover that some of my classmates were Black Republicans, and that the discovery would alter my feelings towards them.

Yale cannot be otherwise than national without insult to her Southern graduates. Had she no Southern graduates, the case would be different; but she has educated us of the South, when we were slaveholders, as well as now, and she has no right to cast us off—to say to us, "My graduates north of Mason and Dixon's line are my children, but you, south of that line, have brought disgrace on me by holding slaves; you are not my children; I know you not."

We shall now be compelled, in self-defence, to do that which we ought to have done long ago, educate our sons exclusively at Southern Colleges; and if the parents of the few Southern students who are now at Yale can suffer them to remain there now, they have different notions from myself of what is due to self-respect.

TENNESSEE.

A DOCTOR OF DIVINITY INDIGNANT.

[The Rev. Robert Baird, D.D., well known in this country as a bitter pro-slavery man, has gone to Berlin, Prussia, as a representative of American Christianity in the meeting of the "Christian Alliance." Under date of Berne, Switzerland, July 31, he writes thus to the *New York Observer*.]

JUST as I was about to leave Geneva, I learned with astonishment that a scheme has been concocted by which the subject of American slavery is to be forced into the Berlin Conference! And a distinguished gentleman of Geneva is to be the instrument for doing a work which our English friends would hardly dare to attempt themselves. Should this be done, I promise you, Messrs. Editors, such a chapter of facts as will surprise you and your readers. All such attempts will be resisted; that you may depend upon. Our German brethren have given no such item in the programme on which, and by which, they have invited their brethren from America. If American slavery is to come in, then I shall insist upon it that three or four other subjects shall come in, one of which shall be the preparation of a "memorial" to the Queen of England, and appointment of a deputation to Lord Palmerston, "On the enormous injury done to humanity by the conquest of India, with its 150,000,000 of inhabitants, by the English, and the conversion of that great country into one vast garden for the production of opium, which they are engaged in forcing on China, with its 350,000,000 of inhabitants, at the mouth of the cannon, thus producing incalculable evil to 500,000,000 human beings, and hindering the spread of the gospel among one-half of the human race!" I, for one, shall insist that at least *this* subject shall be put by the side of American slavery, if our English brethren will force in the subject of slavery—notwithstanding that the Germans have from the outset refused to place it in the programme—employing no matter whom to pull the chesnuts out of the fire for them.

No stone has been left unturned by a certain party to stir up our evangelical brethren at Paris, Lyons, Geneva, Lausanne and Vevay, during the last several months, to address "memorials" and "letters" to our Churches on the subject of slavery, just as if our American Churches are not fully as likely to be acquainted with that subject as the brethren referred to. Of these four or five letters or memorials, I am not aware that more than *one* (that from Geneva) has been published in a single *Southern* paper, religious or secular, or any Northern paper that has much circulation in the South. And because the editors of the paper (the *Central Presbyterian*) that published that address ventured to comment upon it, and express their honest conviction that all such "letters" must fail to do any good worth speaking of, in the part of the country for which it is professed they are intended, Count Gasparin takes them to task with all the zeal, and even fury, of a cavalier of the middle ages. Well, indeed, has it been remarked that our evangelical friends in Paris, Lyons, Geneva, Vevay—in other words, in France and Switzerland, without going further—have enough to do; they need not trouble themselves about our American slavery, which, after all, must be managed by our own people. But more of this at another time.

R. R.

CORNER-STONE OF THE NEW SOUTHERN CHURCH.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE SOUTHERN NEW SCHOOL PRESBYTERIAN CONVENTION, AT RICHMOND.

WHEREAS all acts, resolutions and testimonies of past General Assemblies, and especially the action of the last General Assembly, whereby suspicions and doubts of the good standing and equal rights and privileges of slave holding members of the Church, or imputations and charges against their Christian character, have been either implied or expressed, are contrary to the example and teachings of Christ and his apostles, and are a violation of the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church;

And whereas the relation of master and servant, *in itself considered*, or further than the relative duties arising therefrom, and slavery, as an institution of the States, do not properly belong to the Church judicatories as subjects for discussion and inquiry;

And whereas, in the judgment of this Convention, there is no prospect of the cessation of this agitation of slavery in the General Assembly so long as there are slaveholders in connection with the Church; therefore,

Resolved, That the Presbyteries sympathizing with the objects of this Convention are invited to withdraw from their present ecclesiastical relations.

Resolved, That, in the judgment of this Convention, nothing can be made the basis for discipline in the Presbyterian Church which is not specifically referred to in the Constitution as crime or heresy.

Resolved, That the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church have no power to pronounce a sentence of condemnation on a lower judicatory or individuals for any cause, unless they have been brought before the Assembly in the way prescribed by the Constitution.

Resolved, That the Convention recommend to all Presbyteries in the Presbyterian Church, which are opposed to the agitation of slavery in the highest judicatory of the Church, to appoint delegates, in the proportions prescribed by our form of government for the appointment of commissioners to the Assembly, to meet at Knoxville, Tennessee, on the first Thursday in April, 1858, for the purpose of organizing a General Synod, under the name of "The United Synod of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America."

Resolved, That the members of this Convention adhere to and abide by the confession of faith of the Presbyterian Church, as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures, and that we adhere to the form of government and book of discipline of said Church.

[The following resolution, offered by the Rev. Dr. Newton, of Mississippi, was also adopted:]

Resolved, That the union between us and our Old School brethren, could it be effected on terms acceptable to both sides, would be conducive to the best interests of the Church of Christ, and this Convention, after a free and full interchange of opinion and views on the subject, do now recommend that the Synod, when formed and duly organized, shall invite the General Assembly of the Old School to a fraternal conference with a view to union.

From The Richmond (Va.) Enquirer.

YET at the very time when the leaders of this party (the Fillmore Americans) were using this unpatriotic language, a friend of that candidate, whom they "preferred to Buchanan," was insulting God with the following prayer:

"O, God! we pray that Thou wilt curse the slaveholder in all his undertakings, confound all his plans, and spread terror, horror and dismay throughout the entire South. CURSE, O, GOD, WE ASK THEE, WITH A BLIGHTING CURSE, ALL THE DEMOCRATS IN THE UNION; MAY THEY IN AN ESPECIAL MANNER FEEL THE WEIGHT OF THY GREAT DISPLEASURE. We entreat Thee, O, Lord, to go to Washington and kill Frank Pierce; show him no mercy, but strike him down; also, in your righteous wrath, remember and punish with direful wrath Cass, Douglas, and Toombs; let not one of these villains escape. We ask Thee, O, Lord, to afflict every pro-slavery man in Kansas with the leprosy or smallpox; and may they, after feeling the pains of a thousand deaths, be tumbled headlong into hell without a trial, there to feel ten thousand strokes on their bare backs, daily inflicted by each and every one of the slaves in the United States. Our Heavenly Father, we ask Thee to strengthen us in our resolves to make Kansas a free State at the peril of the Union; we ask Thee to interpose Thy mighty hand in our behalf, and help us to shiver the Union into atoms rather than to concede to the Southern demons, in the form of slave-drivers, one inch of the disputed territory."—*Fourth of July prayer of a Black Republican Clergyman, at Oberlin, Ohio.*

Selections.

THE PRESIDENT PLEADING HIS OWN CASE.

MEMORIAL TO THE PRESIDENT.

THE undersigned, citizens of the United States and electors of the State of Connecticut, respectfully offer to your Excellency this their memorial. The fundamental principle of the Constitution of the United States and of our political institutions is that the people shall make their own laws and elect their own rulers. We see with grief, if not with astonishment, that Gov. Walker of Kansas openly represents and proclaims that the President of the United States is employing, through him (Walker), an army, one purpose of which is to force the people of Kansas to obey laws not their own, nor of the United States, but laws which it is notorious, and established upon evidence, they never made, and rulers they never elected.

We represent, therefore, that, by the foregoing, your Excellency is openly held up and proclaimed, to the great derogation of our national character, as violating in its most essential particular the solemn oath which the President has taken to support the Constitution of this Union. We call attention, further, to the fact that your Excellency is in like manner held up to this nation, to all mankind, and to all posterity, in the attitude of "levying war against [a portion of] the United States," by employing arms in Kansas to uphold a body of men and a code of enactments purporting to be legislative, but which never had the election, nor sanction, nor consent of the people of the Territory. We earnestly represent to your Excellency that we also have taken the oath to obey the Constitution, and your Excellency may rest assured that we shall not refrain from the prayer that Almighty God will make your Administration an example of justice and beneficence, and with His terrible majesty protect our people and our Constitution.

Nathaniel W. Taylor,	C. S. Lyman,	B. Silliman,
Theo. D. Woolsey,	John A. Blake,	Edward C. Herrick,
Henry Dutton,	Wm. H. Russell,	Charles Ives,
Chas L. English,	A. N. Skinner,	Wm. P. Eustis, Jr.,
J. H. Brochway,	Horace Bushnell,	Alexander C. Twining,
Eli W. Blake,	John Boyd,	Josiah W. Gibbs,
Eli Ives,	Charles Robinson,	Alfred Walker,
B. Silliman, Jr.,	Henry Peck,	James Brewster,
Noah Porter,	David Smith,	Stephen G. Hubbard,
Thos. A. Thacher,	J. Hawes,	Hewley Olmstead,
J. A. Davenport,	James F. Babcock,	Seagrove Wm. Magill,
Worthington Hooker,	G. A. Calhoun,	Amos Townsend,
Philos Blake,	E. B. Gilbert,	Timothy Dwight,
E. K. Foster,	Leonard Bacon,	David M. Smith.
	H. C. Kingsley,	

THE PRESIDENT'S REPLY.

WASHINGTON CITY, August 15, 1857.

GENTLEMEN: On my recent return to this city after a fortnight's absence, your memorial, without date, was placed in my hands, through the agency of Mr. Horatio King of the Post-Office Department, to whom it had been intrusted. From the distinguished source whence it proceeds, as well as its peculiar character, I have deemed it proper to depart from my general rule in such cases, and to give it an answer.

You first assert that "the fundamental principle of the Constitution of the United States and of our political institutions is that the people shall make their own laws and elect their own rulers." You then express your grief and astonishment that I should have violated this principle, and, through Gov. Walker, have employed an army, "one purpose of which is to force the people of Kansas to obey laws not their own nor of the United States, but laws which it is notorious, and established upon evidence, they never made, and rulers they never elected." And, as a corollary from the foregoing, you represent that I am "openly held up and proclaimed, to the great derogation of our national character, as violating in its most essential particular the solemn oath which the President has taken to support the Constitution of this Union." These are heavy charges proceeding from gentlemen of your high character, and, if well founded, ought to consign my name to infamy. But in proportion to their gravity, common justice, to say nothing of Christian charity, required that before making them you should have clearly ascertained that they were well founded. If not, they will rebound with withering condemnation upon their authors. Have you performed this preliminary duty toward the man who, however unworthy, is the Chief Magistrate of your country? If so, either you or I are labouring under a strange delusion. Should this prove to be your case, it will present a memorable example of the truth that political prejudice is blind even to the existence of the plainest and most palpable historical facts. To these facts let us refer.

When I entered upon the duties of the Presidential office, on the 4th of March last, what was the condition of Kansas? This Territory had been organized under the act of Congress of 30th May, 1854, and the Government in all its branches was in full operation. A Governor, Secretary of the Territory, Chief-Justice, two Associate Judges, a Marshal and District-Attorney had been appointed by my predecessor, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and were all engaged in discharging their respective duties. A code of laws had been enacted by the Territorial Legislature; and the judiciary were employed in expounding and carrying these laws into effect.

It is quite true that a controversy had previously arisen respecting the validity of the election of the members of the Territorial Legislature, and of the laws passed by them, but at the time I entered upon my official duties Congress had recognised this Legislature in different forms and by different enactments. The Delegate elected to the House of Representatives under a Territorial law had just completed his term of service on the day previous to my inauguration.

In fact, I found the Government of Kansas as well established as that of any other Territory. Under these circumstances, what was my duty? Was it not to sustain this Government? To protect it from the violence of lawless men who were determined either to rule or ruin? To prevent it from being overturned by force? In the language of the Constitution, to "take care that the laws be faithfully executed"?

It was for this purpose, and this alone, that I ordered a military force to Kansas to act as a *posse comitatus* in aiding the civil magistrate to carry the laws into execution. The condition of the Territory at the time, which I need not portray, rendered this precaution absolutely necessary. In this state of affairs would I not have been justly condemned had I left the Marshal and other officers of like character impotent to execute the processes and judgments of the Courts of Justice established by Congress, or by the Territorial Legislature under its express authority, and thus have suffered the Government itself to become an object of contempt in the eyes of the people? And yet this is what you designate as forcing "the people of Kansas to obey laws not their own, nor of the United States," and for doing which you have denounced me as having violated my solemn oath.

I ask, what else could I have done, or ought I to have done? Would you have desired that I should abandon the Territorial Government, sanctioned as it had been by Congress, to illegal violence, and thus renew the scenes of civil war and bloodshed which every patriot in the country had deplored? This would indeed have been to violate my oath of office, and to fix a damning blot on the character of my administration.

I most cheerfully admit that the necessity for sending a military force to Kansas, to aid in the execution of the civil law, reflects no credit upon the character of our country. But let the blame fall upon the heads of the guilty. Whence did this necessity arise? A portion of the people of Kansas, unwilling to trust to the ballot-box, the certain American remedy for redress of all grievances, undertook to create an independent Government for themselves.

Had this attempt proved successful, it would, of course, have subverted the existing Government prescribed and recognised by Congress, and substituted a revolutionary Government in its stead. This was unquestionably the same character as it would be for a portion of the people of Connecticut to undertake to establish a separate Government within its chartered limits for the purpose of redressing any grievance, real or imaginary, of which they might have complained against the legitimate State Government. Such a principle, if carried into execution, would destroy all lawful authority, and produce universal anarchy. I ought to specify more particularly a condition of affairs, which I have embraced only in general terms, requiring the presence of a military force in Kansas.

The Congress of the United States had most wisely declared it to be the true intent and meaning of this act—the act organizing the Territory—not to legislate slavery into any Territory or State, nor to exclude it therefrom, but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States. As a natural consequence, Congress has also prescribed by the same act that when the Territory of Kansas shall be admitted as a State, it shall be received into the Union with or without slavery, as their Constitution may prescribe at the time of their admission. Slavery existed at that period and still exists in Kansas under the Constitution of the United States. This point has at last been finally decided by the highest tribunal known to our laws. How it could ever have been seriously doubted is a mystery. If a confederation of sovereign States acquire a new territory at the expense of their common blood and treasure, surely one set of the partners have no right to exclude the other from its enjoyment by prohibiting them from taking into it whatsoever is recognised to be property by a common Constitution. But when the people—the bona fide residents of such Territory—proceed to frame the State Constitution, then it is their right to decide the important question for themselves, whether they will continue, modify or abolish slavery. To them, and to them alone, does this question belong, free from all foreign interference. In the opinion of the Territorial Legislature of Kansas the time had arrived for entering the Union, and they accordingly passed a law to elect delegates for the purpose of framing a State Constitution. This law was fair and just in its provisions. It conferred the right of suffrage upon every bona fide inhabitant of the Territory, and for the purpose of preventing fraud and the intrusion of citizens of near or distant States, most properly confined this right to those who had resided therein three months previous to the election. Here a fair opportunity was presented for all the qualified resident citizens of the Territory, to whatever organization they might have previously belonged, to participate in the election and to express their opinion at the ballot-box on the question of slavery; but numbers of lawless men still continued to resist the Territorial Goverment. They refused either to be registered or to vote, and the members of the Convention were elected legally and properly without their intervention. The Convention will soon assemble to perform the solemn duty of framing a Constitution for themselves and their posterity, and, in the state of incipient rebellion which still exists in Kansas, it is my imperative duty to employ the troops of the United States, should this become necessary, in defending the Convention against violence while framing the Constitution, and in protecting the bona fide inhabitants qualified to vote under the provisions of this instrument in the free exercise of the right of suffrage, when it shall be submitted to them for their approbation or rejection. I have entire confidence in Gov. Walker, that the troops will not be employed except to resist actual aggression, or in the execution of the laws, and this not until the power of the civil magistrate shall prove unavailing. Following the wise example of Mr. Madison toward the Hartford Convention, illegal and dangerous combinations, such as that of the Topeka Convention, will not be disturbed unless they shall attempt to perform some act which will bring them into actual collision with the Constitution and the laws; in that event they shall be resisted and put down by the whole power of the Government. In performing this duty I shall have the approbation of my own conscience, and, as I humbly trust, of my God. I thank you for the assurance that you will not refrain from prayer that Almighty God will make my administration an example of justice and beneficence. You can greatly assist me in arriving at this consummation by exerting your influence in allaying the existing sectional excitement on the subject of slavery, which has been productive of much evil and no good, and which, if it could succeed in attaining its object, would ruin the slave as well as his master. This would be a work of genuine philanthropy.

Every day of my life I feel how inadequate I am to perform the duties of my high station without the continued support of Divine Providence, yet, placing my trust in Him, and in Him alone, I entertain a good hope that He will enable me to do equal justice to all portions of the Union, and thus render me an humble instrument in restoring peace and harmony among the people of the several States.

Yours very respectfully,

JAMES BUCHANAN.

The Rev. THEODORE D. WOOLSEY, D.D., LL. D., and others.

THE TRIBUNE'S ANSWER TO THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. Buchanan insultingly advises the memorialists to make themselves familiar with the essential facts with regard to the troubles in Kansas, when not only is it clear that they already understand these facts, but that he is not willing to confront those which are well known to him. The vital, the controlling fact in the case is the suppression of the voice of Kansas in her election of March 30, 1855, by conspiracy in and armed invasion from the neighbouring State. Such suppression is directly affirmed in the memorial, and a reference made to the official documents by which it is demonstrated beyond cavil. And if this *is* a fact—if the "laws of Kansas" which Mr. Buchanan is enforcing on her people by the sabres and bayonets of half the Federal army are indeed no laws, but really frauds and impostures, originating not with settlers of Kansas, but with invaders from Missouri—is it not a horrible wrong to be holding Kansas in subjection to those laws in spite of her prayers and her struggles? But this vital, this controlling question, Mr. Buchanan skulks and evades! He cannot go back to consider what was done in Kansas, or by whom, in March, 1855; he can look that way no further than March 4, 1857. Then he was inaugurated President, and found the bogus Government in full operation, and he cannot travel back to consider the rightfulness of its origin.

This is Tyranny's oldest dodge. Every gigantic villany is hoary with prescription—covers itself with moss—pleads "estoppel"—insists that you shall take things as you find them. When Congress was urged to probe the iniquity of that Kansas Territorial election, we had all this ground pettifogged over day after day. Yet the House ordered an investigation nevertheless; and, on the strength of its result, ejected Whitfield from a seat as delegate. True, he did just squeeze in again at the last Session, but not until after he had been once ejected, and by the barest majority—a majority made up of two or three Pennsylvania Members who turned their backs on themselves because of Slavery's triumph in Mr. Buchanan's election. They based their treachery on Mr. Buchanan's success, and now he justifies his league with the oppressors of Kansas by referring to the fruits of their treachery. Mr. Buchanan found Kansas in this condition—he will not inquire how it came so—it is enough for him that it is so—and he seeks to throw the responsibility on Congress. Yet to do this he is driven to material suppressions which have the effect of direct falsifications. The popular branch of Congress tried earnestly and repeatedly to lift the heavy yoke of oppression off the neck of Kansas. Even after the Republicans were beaten in the Nation, and when there was at least ten majority against them in the House, they passed, by nearly twenty majority, a bill abolishing the Border-Ruffian Legislature and all its works, and ordering a new and carefully guarded election to replace it by authorities really chosen by the people of Kansas. This bill did not become a law, simply because Mr. Buchanan's partisans in the Senate would not let it. Had James Buchanan himself simply said, "I desire the passage of that bill, in order that the troubles in Kansas may be settled by a fair appeal to her own citizens," and backed his words by his works, all the troubles in Kansas would ere this have been ended. Yet now he makes the refusal of his partisans in Congress to do that act of necessary justice a conclusive reason why justice should not be done!

After this bill had failed, the House refused repeatedly to make appropriations for the payment of the Legislature of Kansas, simply because the majority knew the assumption of authority by that Legislature to be a wicked, oppressive usurpation. The Senate refused to pass the appropriation bill without this item; so, finally, after repeated disagreements and conferences, the House gave way and let this pass by one or two majority. And this is the basis of the President's assertion that "Congress had recognised this Legislature by different forms and by different enactments." That must have been a low school of pettifogging from which our Chief Magistrate graduated.

Throughout this manifesto the people of Kansas are accounted nothing; their rights, their feelings, their liberties nothing—the usurping Government and the bogus "laws" are everything. The coolness of this Lord High Protector of double-dyed villany and fraud, in charging the Free State men of Kansas with unwillingness "to trust to the ballot-box, that certain American remedy for all grievances"—when they had soon shot a certain remedy" wrested from them by Missouri revolvers and bowie-knives, and made to legalize and sanctify a high-handed iniquity—is amazing. The man either does not himself read or he writes supposing others do not.

We thank the President for telling the country so frankly that "slavery existed and still exists in Kansas." The Dred Scott decision—or rather, some of the opinions read in support of that decision—presume this. That decision, or those opinions, make every foot of Federal Territory Slave Territory. If a Federal District were carved out of Ohio to-morrow, that District would, according to the Dred Scott judgment, be slaveholding. Kansas is under the feet of the Slave Power, and her rescue is a work of time and difficulty. What is to be encountered in the future of this struggle may be judged by what we now see. The bogus Registry for the late Constitutional Election is eulogized by Mr. Buchanan as fair and impartial, and as affording to "all qualified resident citizens of the Territory" opportunity to vote! Let us test this assertion by facts: The new town of Quindaro was not visited by a bogus census-taker, but the citizens made up and certified a list of one hundred and sixty-one legal electors, sending the names, three of whom were Buchanan and Walker men. *Those three were inscribed on the registry and all the rest omitted!* And it was very much like this throughout Kansas. Nobody was invited to present himself to be registered—all were to be waited on by the proper officers. Yet, when the registry was completed, it was notorious that a large majority of the names on it were those of pro slavery men, while not one-sixth of the Free State men were registered! The strongest and most populous Free State men had no registry at all. The men who managed this registry are Mr. Buchanan's warmest supporters. He has lavished on them all his lucrative and responsible offices in the Territory. They will decide who shall vote on the adoption or rejection of the Constitution about to be framed under their auspices; and whatever they decide, Mr. Buchanan has his cannon and sabres ready to enforce. Against such an array of fraud and force what can the scattered people of Kansas do? There is help for them only in God, and subordinately in the millions of hearts which in all the States beat true to Freedom.

THE AMERICAN METHODIST DEPUTATION TO ENGLAND.

INTERESTING LETTER FROM THE REV. E. MATTHEWS.

Correspondence of the American Baptist.

BRISTOL, Aug. 13, 1857.

BISHOP SIMPSON and Dr. McClintock, the deputation from the Northern Methodist Episcopal Slaveholding Church, having arrived in England, three Anti-Slavery Societies sent addresses to the Conference requesting that body not to receive them. They were received, however, and thus the Conference has sanctioned slavery. A short sketch of this agitation may prove useful as well as interesting to the readers of the *Baptist*, and to all who refuse to fellowship slaveholders.

The English Wesleyan deputations to the American Methodists have, without exception, riveted the chains of the slave by sanctioning a slaveholding religion. This was understood by few of the Wesleyans, and by a small portion only of the British public. The last English deputation, Dr. Hannah and Rev. Mr. Jobson, on returning, spoke in the Conference held last year in this city in the highest terms of the anti-slavery character of the American Northern Methodist Church, and announced the coming of the American deputation. I anticipated that the deputation, being in fellowship with slaveholders, would oppose one of the fundamental principles of the Free Mission Society, that no fellowship should be extended to slaveholders; they would also be antagonistic to the anti-slavery movement generally, by turning aside that tide of sympathy which would otherwise flow towards the friends of the slave in America. I sent, therefore, a letter to the London *Morning Advertiser* and some other papers, contrasting the false statement of Mr. Jobson, that the Methodist Church was anti-slavery, with the truth as given in the Appendix to "Dred."

Providentially I happened to preach one Sunday in Yorkshire, near where Mr. Jobson was preaching, and had an interview with him on the connection of the above Church with slavery; he stated that the Church was anti-slavery, for it would not allow its ministers to hold slaves. I requested a copy of the rule, which he kindly allowed, but on reading it I called his attention to the fact that the unquoted portion qualified that quoted. The rule reads as follows, and the part omitted by Mr. Jobson is enclosed in brackets, and is contained in the Book of Discipline of the American Methodist Episcopal Church:

"2. What shall be done for the extirpation of the evil of slavery?

"A. 1. We declare that we are as much as ever convinced of the great evil of slavery; therefore no slaveholder shall be eligible to any official station in our Church hereafter [where the laws of the State in which he lives will admit of emancipation, and permit the liberated slave to enjoy freedom].

"A. 2. When any travelling preacher becomes an owner of a slave or slaves, by any means, he shall forfeit his ministerial character in our Church [unless he executes, if it be practicable, a legal emancipation of such slaves, conformably to the laws of the State in which he lives]."

It will be seen that the saving clause permits the minister in certain cases to hold slaves.

Next, Mr. Jobson went to Sheffield and made a speech in defence of the Methodist Church, stating that the authoress of "Dred" had stated a falsehood in the work, in declaring the majority of the Methodist Church to have sanctioned slavery at the Conference in Indianapolis; he added, he did not suppose the falsehood was intentional. I then wrote six letters to the *Bristol Advertiser*, reviewing the whole policy of British and American Methodism in relation to slavery, and showing to what an extent English Wesleyan influence was, without their being conscious of it, directed to the up-building of the system of slavery. I looked for a reply, for in Bristol as well as throughout England there are talented Methodist ministers. As no one replied, I prepared an outline of the argument and facts and sent to the London *Morning Advertiser*, the *Morning Star*, the *Leeds Mercury* and some other papers. These being published, I again looked for a reply. As none was made and the deputation were now looked for, I wrote to some of the Anti-Slavery Societies to ascertain their willingness to send addresses to the Conference, requesting that body not to receive the deputation. The "Leeds Young Men's Anti-Slavery Society," the "Leeds Anti-Slavery Committee," and the "Manchester Anti-Slavery Committee," willingly sent addresses to the Conference, earnestly and respectfully requesting that body to decline to receive the deputation of a slaveholding Church.

The address of the "Leeds Young Men's Anti-Slavery Society" appeared in the *Leeds Mercury*, the Liverpool papers and two of the Bristol papers. This revealed to some of the Wesleyans the fact concealed from them for thirteen years, that their leaders were in correspondence with a slaveholding Church. The Manchester Address also appeared in some of the papers. The press is a power; and now letters were written in defence of the American Methodist deputation. At first it was argued that no sanction would be afforded to the slavery of the Methodist Church by receiving its deputation, just as no sanction was afforded to the slavery of the United States by receiving its ambassador. In reply it was shown that political relations differed from those of religion, and that to receive a deputation from a religious body afforded moral and religious sanction to the body represented. The discussion was so extended that about twenty letters on the subject appeared in the Liverpool *Mercury*. To make extracts from them all would unduly extend this letter. I can only state the positions taken on each side, and give two or three brief extracts.

Soon after the discussion commenced, the Irish Wesleyan Conference assembled, and the American deputation strongly and solemnly declared their Church to be anti-slavery. Bishop Simpson said, in the Conference, "The Methodist Church in America was the first Church in the world, so far as I know, to introduce into its rules one which forbids the buying or selling of men, women and children in America." Dr. McClintock said, "If anything could make me angry, it would be to be told in Ireland or in England that the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States of America is either formally or actually, in name or in reality, in pretence or in substance, a pro-slavery Church. I might in such a case be tempted in my haste to say the man was a liar. No; nothing but baseness of purpose, or absolute and wilful ignorance, could cause any man in England, Ireland or America to say this." Your Leeds correspondent, feeling grieved, no doubt, that such false statements should be made, administered to the Bishop a censure that must have made him feel how different the moral atmosphere of England is from that of a slave State, where falsehood and moral cowardice often assume the name of religion. But to the extract:

"Now the Bishop has knowingly deceived the English Methodists by quoting this rule as evidence of the Church he represents being anti-slavery. This rule was passed sixty-eight years ago, and yet no one claims an anti-slavery character for the Northern Methodist Episcopal Church until 1844, so that this rule cannot, by their own admission, have been enforced for fifty-five years; therefore it is as likely as not to be still inoperative. And (*à lá* 'J. M. K.') I leave your readers to judge what dependence can be placed upon any of the statements made in the Bishop's speech, when we find him in the outset indulging in flagrant misrepresentations."

The Conference now met in Liverpool. I forwarded to each member a small sheet I had brought out, 'The Mirror of the Anti-Slavery Struggle," containing the six letters from my pen published in the *Bristol Advertiser*, and then in some of the papers gave notice of the class of facts thus placed before the members, and that each had proof from American Methodist papers that slave-trading and slaveholding were practised by members of the Church the deputation represented. The papers named were the *Southern Methodist Itinerant*, the Auburn *Christian Advocate*, and a statement of the Rev. B. Sedgwick. Thus did light stream in upon the Conference. During the discussion thus far I am not aware that the *Watchman*, the organ of English Wesleyans, had condescended to notice it by so much as a passing paragraph. When, however, it learned that each member of the Conference had received so large and well authenticated a class of facts, it began to "cry aloud and spare not," lifting up its voice, not against slavery for its sinfulness, nor yet against the deputation for its hypocritical conduct, but against the Leeds Young Men's Anti-Slavery Society, for assuming to appeal to the Conference. The article occupied about two columns, and seems carefully prepared, evidently designed to ward off an anticipated crisis. It admits that there are slaveholders in the American Methodist Church, who are so voluntarily; and though, in the succeeding issue, an attempt is made to make out that they are all the victims of circumstances, still we can reply, what it has written it has written. It urges that the deputation be received most certainly. They were received, and stated that their Church had been anti-slavery from the time it was first planted by Mr. Wesley until now; and so far from any member of the Conference contradicting the false statements, the *Watchman* states that, at the close of Bishop Simpson's speech, "notwithstanding the attempt of the President to restrain any expression of feeling, the Bishop sat down at the close of this able, interesting and eloquent address amid loud and long-continued applause."

Many will suppose that this ended the discussion; but that which Satan looks upon as an end is only with the Lord a part of the means he is using to some other end. A nobleman once pointed to a picture of the crucifixion of Christ, when conversing with Wilberforce, and said, "Young man, you set up for a reformer; see here the end of reformers." Now, instead of the death of Christ being the end of a reformer, it has proved an unwasting fountain of reformatory influences. I think the agitation among the Wesleyans is but just installed. Certainly this letter I now write evinces that a good deal may be said on the subject yet. The *Morning Advertiser* published an extended article from my pen, reviewing the Conference, and, in a lecture last week in the Baptist chapel, Bedminister, I referred to the conduct of the Conference, the facts before it, its silence in regard to the facts, and its reception of the deputation in disregard of the same facts. Reports of which appear in the *Bristol Advertiser* and the *Bristol Gazette*.

But I promised to notice the prominent points in the discussion.

The three important arguments used in defence of the Methodist Church were, 1st: That its discipline showed that it had been always anti-slavery. 2: That in 1844 its anti-slavery principles caused half a million of pro-slavery members to withdraw from the body. 3: Some of its ministers have been mobbed by pro-slavites, and one has died prematurely, because of their anti-slavery principles.

It is evident, however, that an anti-slavery Church would not have half a million of pro-slavery members without some one playing the part of a deceiver. So the first two positions are antagonistic.

I refer to the most important points defended by the friends of the slave. They argued that the Church, from its formation till now, has never been without slaveholding members; that in 1836 the General Conference prohibited the members from aiding the anti-slavery cause; that in 1840 it prohibited coloured members from bearing testimony against the whites, and declared slaveholding no disqualification for its highest ministerial offices; that the Annual Conferences of South Carolina and Georgia declared slavery not a moral evil; and the former eulogized the bishops for attempting to suppress the anti-slavery efforts; that the work, "American Slavery as it is," proved that a coloured Methodist preacher was hung on suspicion, that a Methodist preacher dealt in slaves, that a Methodist preacher was a slave-driver, that a Methodist slave-girl was whipped for her chastity, that a Methodist woman, to punish a slave-girl, cut off her toe with a chisel, and it was contended that the Methodist Church raised no objections to these doings.

It was farther shown that at least 1,000 slaveholders are now members of the body; that a fearful amount of moral cowardice prevails among Northern Methodists, who stand in awe of a standing threat of the Baltimore Conference, which declares it will leave the body if non-slaveholding is made a condition of membership; that a Methodist minister in Wisconsin sent two young women, legally free, into slavery; that, after years of agitation, the Anti-Slavery Societies sent a deputation to the Conference to bring a charge of kidnapping against him; that he was tried, found guilty of the crime, and silenced, but the Conference, fearing the pro-slavery party, restored him to his standing, and dismissed him to preach to the slaveholders. To this latter fact I can testify, having been selected as a deputation to visit the Conference, that the charge might be brought.

In closing I would add that there are three principles which the Conference in England have practically ignored. 1: That a rule which admits 1,000 members to hold slaves, would admit 800,000. 2: That a Church which intelligently sanctions slaveholding among its members is responsible for it and corrupted by it. 3: That whatever is done to Christ's suffering members is done to Christ himself.

Yours for the slave,

EDWARD MATTHEWS.

P. S. By the *Watchman* received to-day, I perceive that Dr. McClintock has made a confession speech in the Conference acknowledging that the Church has 1,000 slaveholding members, that he voted at the Indianapolis Conference against excluding slaveholders, and several other points, to which I shall advert in another letter.

A NEW SLAVE STATE.

From The American Missionary.

SOME dozen or more years ago, a delegate to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church (we think it was Judge Stevens of Indiana) said in that body that the time would come when a new State, formed out of the Chocktaw and Cherokee nations, would apply for admission to the Union, and that, as the consequence of the missionary policy then in vogue (that of admitting slaveholders to membership in the mission Churches), it would be a slaveholding State.

The following scrap, cut from a Southern paper, shows that such a project is now being discussed.

A NEW SOUTHERN STATE.—S. Fulsom, a Choctaw, and one of the most prominent of his nation, paid us a visit yesterday. Mr. Fulsom is in favour of having the Indian Territory west of Arkansas, between the Red and Arkansas rivers, and extending westward to the one hundredth degree of west longitude, organized into a State and admitted into the Union. We think such a step absolutely necessary for the protection of the South. The Choctaws and Cherokees are slaveholders, and would add another slaveholding State to the Confederacy. The treachery of Buchanan has given Kansas to the North; let the South, before it is too late, create a barrier against this Vandal encroachment, which is fast enmeshing her. These Indian tribes are better citizens, more advanced in the principles of our government and laws than the people of New Mexico, or the mongrel adventurers from foreign nations and our own who are to make a free State of Kansas.—*Memphis Enquirer, July* 16.

For more than thirty years missionary labour has been largely expended among these tribes of Indians, and, judging only from the number of "converts" and the improvement of the Indians, in temperance, agriculture, education, and other things, concerning which the missionaries sought to

and healthful climate, make a comfortable living, and *do much good*. I see no reason why the enterprising may not acquire wealth. Then let the capitalist come, buy lands, establish factories, and build up towns. Let the poor man come, and, by industry and enterprise, demonstrate what free labour can do.

I have heard of seven good families who say they are willing to come if a colony can be formed. It has been suggested that all who are willing to come send their names to S. S. Jocelyn, No. 48 Beekman street, New York; or to myself, at Berea, Madison County, Ky. Then let a suitable committee be appointed to further survey lands, report, and then buy. This State, with only 38,000 slaveholders in it, could soon be snatched from the blighting curse of slavery, if the friends of humanity and of Christianity would give themselves to the glorious work. Will papers friendly to the enterprise copy? Will friends at home and abroad make suggestions and coöperate?

JOHN G. FEE.

FRUITS OF SLAVERY IN TEXAS.

From The Times.

THE innumerable lawless acts into which the Southerners are every day forced for the preservation of the peculiar institution have been for years slowly producing results which, even in their present stage of development, may well make us tremble. They have made trial by jury a mockery, and the liberty of the Press a snare, and the *Habeas Corpus* Act waste paper. It may be necessary that such things should be; that men should be lynched and banished by mobs; that, in dealing with offences of a certain character, Vigilance Committees should usurp the seat of Justice; but we warn the people among whom such practices exist that every one of these spasmodic outbreaks of popular indignation is a blow struck at Freedom herself; more deadly, because more insidious, than the open assaults of a despot.

We are led into these remarks by the report of a public meeting recently held at San Antonia, Texas, by a number of the leading merchants of that town, for the purpose of denouncing the outrages committed by bands of armed citizens upon the Mexican teamsters transporting goods from Matagorda Bay to the city. From the very first the Mexicans in Texas, in spite of their being guaranteed by treaty a full and equal participation in the rights of American citizenship, have been robbed, maltreated, and banished wholesale. Mr. Olmsted mentions, in his *Texas Journey*, that at Austin, in 1853, a meeting was held, at which it was resolved that all the resident Mexicans were horse-thieves, and twenty families were accordingly driven from their homes. A similar occurrence took place at Seguin, in 1854. Even at San Antonio, where the Mexicans form a majority of the population, an attempt was made to raise a *posse* for the sheriff to drive them from their homes, and the scheme was only frustrated by the refusal of the Germans to take part in it. There is a general feeling among the Americans that the Mexicans are "impertinent," and ought to be exterminated.

The pro-slavery faction, reckless of all consequences, are intent upon driving them from the country. Texas, at this moment, swarms with vigilance committees, whose action is mainly directed against these unfortunates, whom we have blessed by casting over them the ægis of our Constitution. The San Antonio committee alone has hanged over twenty persons.

At the meeting to which we have referred, resolutions were passed denouncing these outrages in very strong terms, and calling upon the teamsters to resist, and pledging themselves to use every means to bring the lawless ruffians who assail them to justice. The testimony they bear to the character of the Mexicans is worth quoting:

Resolved, That we would suggest to the teamsters, &c., of the lower country, who complain of our preference for the employment of Mexican carmen, at low prices, instead of employing *them*, that the price of hauling, like that of other commodities, is regulated by the great law of supply and demand, and is beyond *their* control; and that they should reflect, before resorting to violence towards their Mexican rivals, that the blame, if any, rests on the community that cannot consume goods sufficient to give employment to all engaged in hauling, and not on the Mexicans; and that teamsters, as well as others, who can't get work at their own business, must find some other employment. That our reasons for preferring to employ Mexicans in hauling our goods is because we find them, after the experience of years, the most reliable carriers, doing their work with promptness, and manifesting a faithfulness in fulfilling their contracts unequalled —qualities that, in all communities, will give preference to any body of men, for any employment.

GIDDINGS ON COMPENSATED EMANCIPATION.

[JOSHUA R. GIDDINGS, in the *Ashtabula* (O.) *Sentinel*, thus expresses his sentiments in relation to the project for abolishing slavery by compensating the slaveholders for their chattels.]

WE have felt no disposition to throw obstacles in the way of any class of men seeking to do good. The formation of this Society is now a matter of history, and its success or failure will soon become a fact, and we are willing to leave the result for time to disclose. But as political journalists we may state some of the difficulties which we apprehend will never be surmounted:

We do not believe the Constitution of the United States will be so amended as to authorize Congress to appropriate money for this extensive purchase of slaves.

Secondly, The slaveholders and slave States will never sell their slaves until constrained to do so by actual necessity.

Thirdly, The people of the free States, in our opinion, will never acknowledge the right of any class of men to hold God's image in degrading servitude, or to sell or buy immortal beings. Nor will they willingly consent to pay their money to men who deserve the halter far more than a pecuniary compensation for their crimes. Nor has the corruption and tyranny of the Slave Power in Kansas, or in Congress, or in the Executive or Judicial departments of Government, tended to conciliate the people of the free States.

This redemption of captives from slavery was practised in the darker ages; but all civilized nations abandoned it as barbarous and heathenish as early as the sixteenth century. The Turks, being a semi-barbarous people, continued to seize and enslave Christians, under pretence of doing so in order to convert them to Mahometanism; but would consent to their ransom precisely as our slaveholders now do, by the payment of money. The Barbary States, from their local position, had great advantages for seizing and enslaving Christians.

In 1270, Phillip the Bold, with a combined force of English and French, attacked Tunis with *fire and sword*, and released all the slaves. This was right and just. They refused to pay $325 per slave for their redemption, as it is now proposed to pay off slaveholders, who are far more worthy of the sword and bayonet than the slaveholders of Tunis were.

In the latter part of the last century the Algerines seized and enslaved the citizens of the United States. Many friends were desirous of redeeming their relations held in Algerine slavery. Old men will recollect the time when they were called on for donations to redeem native-born Americans from servitude in Algiers precisely as Mr. Burritt now calls on the free States to contribute for the redemption of Southern slaves from a slavery worse than that of Algiers.

But the American Government denied that the Algerines had any right whatever to those slaves. We proclaimed them *pirates*. The civilized world pronounced them pirates, enemies of mankind, and worthy of death. Before God and our country, we declare them to have been less guilty than the slaveholders of the United States now are, inasmuch as they were more ignorant. Our Government sent a navy to Algiers, and the slaveholders of that Government were put to the sword; they were butchered for their insolent piracies, and the slaves were released. This was just and right. It was manly—becoming an enlightened people. Have the sons of freedom in the Northern States now become so degenerate, so destitute of manly courage and self-respect, as to consent to be made tributaries to the petty despots of the South?

We have ourselves paid money to redeem Southern slaves until we have become disgusted with the practice, and prefer that our future donations shall be made in *powder and ball*, delivered to the slaves, to be used as they may deem proper. G.

THE RIGHT MAN IN THE RIGHT PLACE.

From The N. Y. Times.

AFTER all, the eternal fitness of things *is* sometimes vindicated, even to man's imperfect vision, and in this very topsy-turvy world; and the French proverb, *à bon cheval bon cavalier*, which is so commonly a hopeless prayer, does sometimes become a pæan of praise.

Hercules strangling lions and choking giants, Alexander the Great whipping the world, Lord Palmerston snubbing Mr. Disraeli, the Chevalier Wykoff managing the Parker Vein organ (the *Herald*), and Mayor Wood supporting the Lowber claim, are all delightful spectacles to the well-ordered mind of activity appropriately engaged.

But since the "bill for giving everybody everything" was confided to the parliamentary care of Mr. Tittlebat Titmouse, we have never stumbled upon so cheering, so satisfactory, so altogether ideal an instance of the adaptation of means to end as is afforded to the admiration of mankind in the announcement that Mr. John Mitchel, late of Ireland, Bermuda or Botany Bay, as the case may be, and now of Knoxville, in the State of Tennessee, is about to assume the editorial charge of a paper, to be called the *Southern Citizen*, with the view of advocating the "reopening of the slave-trade."

This notable project is in all respects congenial alike to the character and capacities to the "exile" in whom it has found its prophet and its priest. Having tasted himself the quality of the "middle passage," in a convict ship, Mr. Mitchel will be able to speak advisedly when he expatiates upon the advantages of that mode of travel, and recommends the hold of the slave-ship to "intending emigrants" of the African race. Forced himself (as he has so often and so elaborately assured whomsoever he could induce to hear him) to dwell in a foreign land, far from the scenes of his youth and the friends of his heart, he will, doubtless, be able to explain to the desolate savages whom he desires to entice into the vicinity of that "well-stocked plantation," which is his earthly Paradise, how greatly they ought to exult in being delivered from the burden of old associations and the egregious bore of domestic attachments. Sprung from a race which has worn for centuries what Mr. Mitchel is fond of describing as the "oppressor's yoke," he can enlarge with legitimate and affecting unction upon the tendency of a condition of servitude to develope the milder and diviner qualities of the human soul, and to make of a life "with the shovel and the hoe" a lively image of celestial bliss. Add to all this that the project to which Mr. Mitchel proposes to consecrate his energies is admitted even by South Carolinian enthusiasts to be utterly impracticable—as impracticable as an argument with the east wind—as impracticable as Mr. Dudley Mann's thirty-thousand-ton ferry-boats from Milford Haven, in Wales, to Norfolk, in Virginia—as impracticable as the conquest of England by four Irish gentlemen wearing green waistcoats and riding madly upon the Saxon in a barouche and pair—as impracticable, in a word, as Slievegamon itself, and it will be seen that if the African slave-trade has waited long for its apostle, it has found him at last.

In behalf of a people wearied with over-much work, and in the name of a press which groans with gravity, we beg leave furthermore to suggest that the editor of the *Southern Citizen* be appointed and ordained to prepare, draw up and publish exclusively in his own columns, all future reports of all future "Southern Conventions," whether held at Knoxville or elsewhere. The proceedings of a "Southern Convention," reported by Mr. John Mitchel, would be a real blessing to journalism, and ought to be encouraged by all the Boards of Health throughout the country, for the sake of the public diaphragm.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

WITHOUT CONCEALMENT—WITHOUT COMPROMISE.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 1857.

THE COMPENSATION CONVENTION.

THE worthy Mr. Elihu Burritt, since he exchanged the labours of his forge for the more arduous duties of a physician of the body politic, has been distinguished for the mildness and gentleness of his style of practice. He belongs to the class of doctors who follow what is called the Expectant System. Or, perhaps, he may be ranked among the Homœopathic practitioners, who deal only in infinitesimal exhibitions of medicine. He does not shock the sensibilities of his patients by ugly prescriptions written in cabalistic characters, nor disgust their palates with doses of allopathic magnitude and bitterness. His drugs conceal their unsavoury virtues, if any such they have, in the circumambient ocean of jelly that encompasses them. His philosophy is, not to drive the sick man from his door by the nauseousness of his administrations or an unpleasant explicitness as to the character of his disease. We are sorry to say that his success has not been equal to the excellence of his intentions. The diseases he has taken in hand still walk with the pestilence in the darkness and scatter their arrows at noon-day. For instance, for several years he has drenched England and the Continent with the mild decoctions of his Olive Leaves. If we are not mistaken, the Emperor Nicholas once took a dose of them. But, for all that, there has been no lack of wars and fightings, and the Crimea has been turned into a new Golgotha, since he commenced practice.

His latest essay to cure the ills the world is heir to is to abolish Slavery by the simple process of buying up the slaves, or rather of purchasing their freedom of their masters by a joint-stock operation of the United States and the Slave States. It seems to us that this scheme is open to the objection to which the plans of our infancy for catching birds, by the imposition of salt upon their caudal plumage, was liable. The consent of the birds, and of very old, crafty and knowing ones, too, is essential to the success of the operation. But of that, by and bye. In aid of this benevolent speculation, he succeeded in collecting together, at Cleveland, a considerable number of very respectable gentlemen, hardly any among them being under the degree of a Professor, while many rejoiced in the full-blown glories of a Doctorate in Divinity. These benevolent persons, in the most liberal manner, voted to purchase the slaves of their masters at an average price of $250, leaving the balance to be settled between the masters and the States in which they lived. We do not mean, of course, that they proposed to pay this sum out of their own pockets; but they expressed their willingness that the Slavery question should be settled in this way, and that they were willing to pay their proportion as Northern citizens. As the political power of these worthy persons to procure this action from the Government was about equal to their financial capacity to provide the funds it would demand, we do not see what they expected to accomplish by this assembling of themselves together. But as they were, undoubtedly, able to pay their own travelling expenses, and had a perfect right to indulge themselves in the relaxation of a western tour, we will freely admit that this is none of our business.

Of course we understand perfectly well that the Convention was called to attract public attention to the plan which had found favour in their eyes. But, it seems to us, they have not yet constructed the foundation on which to edify their Society up to the Emancipation they desiderate. They appear to have forgotten that it takes two to make a bargain; that an essential element in a sale is the willingness of the owner to sell. Whenever the slaveholders shall intimate their readiness to enter into a *trade* of this sort, then the time will have come to ask the people of the North whether they are disposed to buy. For buying and selling it really is, in whatever swaddling-clothes of words the thing may be wrapped up. For example, we should think it altogether premature for the Land Reformers to meet in Convention and vote that the Legislature of this State shall purchase the lands of Mr. Gerrit Smith, or of Mr. William B. Astor, at an eighth of what those gentlemen estimate their value. As soon as the great landholders have taken the initiative, then the corresponding movement may be made to meet it. Of course anybody has a right to say how much he will give for his neighbour's property. But the assertion is of no great practical value, until we have reason to believe that our neighbour is willing to strike a bargain. We need hardly say that we do not put property in man and in land on the same footing: only that is the level on which we must treat with the slaveholders for their slaves, if at all. And this brings us to the next head of our discourse.

There is another thing to be considered, in a proposed transaction of this kind, besides the willingness of the possessor to part with the thing possessed. It is whether he has any right at all to its possession. Slaves either are property or they are not. If they are, then it is rather cool to ask their owner to part with them for exactly an eighth he holds them at. If they are not, then to treat with the person holding them wrongfully, as if he had an actual rightful interest in them, is an action which has a very strong savour of immorality about it. What right has Mr. Burritt and his Society to chaffer with the stealers of men for the human beings they have stolen? Do they not see that they are confounding all moral distinctions, and actually strengthening the hands of the oppressor to crush the innocent by the very policy which they propose to use to deliver them from his gripe? This is the inhering vice of every scheme of compensation. It admits the right of property, in admitting the right of remuneration for the relinquishment of the property. We know that many honest gentlemen will deny our proposition, but we defy them to put it into any shape in which a slaveholder will look at and make it anything else. Let them approach him as they would a Barbary corsair and propose to ransom his victims for a price, and see how he will receive the overture! We fear that Mr. Burritt himself would find his crown of Olive Leaves soon exchanged for one of martyrdom, if he should act as the intercessor in his proper person. And we venture to affirm beforehand that, if Mr. Burritt's Society have even a name to live, it will be only by accepting and fostering what Lord Brougham called "the wild and guilty phantasy that man can have property in man."

Now we have palliatives enough of this crying sin of the land already, enough lenitives for hurt minds, enough lullabies for awakened consciences. What is needed is not cries of "peace, peace, when there is no peace"—not Utopian dreams of impossible methods of being rid of our common guilt, to soothe anxious inquirers into a belief that they are labouring for emancipation while they are blocking the way to it. We need a keener comprehension of the exceeding sinfulness of this sin above all others, and of the guilt as well as the folly of pandering to it in weak and futile measures, which only distract men's minds from the real point and issue and give them an excuse for avoiding it. It is not money that is to settle this question. It is not even the willingness of men to part with their money in order to settle it. It is conscience—a sense of the guilt and shame of slavery, in which we all partake, aroused to the point of a determination to be rid of it at any expense of money, of Church Organizations, of Political Systems, of all our most cherished idolizing—it is this that is to be the lever that will uplift slavery from off the heart of the nation, and rid it of that hideous nightmare and sure precursor of impending death. Such palliatives as this Society of Mr. Burritt only exacerbate the disease, and, to the extent of their feeble power, retard the remedy.

We think it very likely, indeed, that, when the time of emancipation actually arrives, this question of compensation will come up, and, in all probability, be yielded to the slaveholders. When the public opinion of the world shall have grown up to a point of strength which the sure instinct of slavery will see to be irresistible, when the nations of the earth will be ready to preach a new Crusade against the infidels that defile the living temples of the Most High God and to rescue them from their polluting grasp, and when the North shall feel the movement of the world deeply enough to refuse to put herself between the South and her fate, in whatever guise the instant urgency of Emancipation approaches the slaveholder, then he will begin to demand compensation for doing what he can no longer hinder. And the North, so long accustomed to yield to his extortions, will, it is but too likely, agree to pay him for his escape from utter destruction. But this is a result which need not have the way prepared before it by Mr. Burritt. It will come soon enough. The slaveholders will not take compensation as long as they can keep their hold of their slaves. If any one think they ought to be paid for being at once delivered from their sin and the poverty with which their sin has cursed their land, let him prepare the way by helping to create that public sentiment which will make it impossible for them to keep their grasp upon their slaves.

THE AMERICAN METHODIST DEPUTATION IN ENGLAND.

ABOLITIONISTS on both sides of the Atlantic should be grateful to the Rev. EDWARD MATTHEWS (an American Baptist minister, who has been for several years in England), for his faithful efforts to enlighten the Methodists of Great Britain in respect to the pro-slavery character of the American Methodist Episcopal Church, and to urge upon them the duty of refusing to receive the delegates sent by that Church to the British Wesleyan Conference. The account of his labours in this behalf, which we have placed on the first page, is worthy of careful attention. That he failed to induce the English Methodists to take the step which Christian consistency so obviously required is no matter of surprise to those who can appreciate the almost invincible power of sectarian and denominational ties, and the general indisposition of ecclesiastical bodies to pursue an uncompromising course in relation to sins which cannot be rebuked and expelled without endangering the harmony which is their pride and boast.

Since the letter of Mr. Matthews was in type, we have read the speeches of Bishop Simpson and Dr. McClintock in the Wesleyan Conference, as reported by the *London Watchman*, and we are constrained to say that, so far as the subject of slavery is concerned, they exhibit more craft than candour, more ingenuity in evading the question at issue than truthfulness in its treatment. Both of them declared, unequivocally, that the American Methodist Episcopal Church was an anti-slavery Church. Bishop Simpson said:

"The Church of our fathers has been an anti-slavery Church from the day it was planted by John Wesley to the present day. Before any other denomination had introduced a rule on the subject, it placed among its fundamental rules one which could not be altered without much difficulty, and which stated that it was contrary to Christian doctrine and fellowship to buy or sell any man, woman, or child, with intention to enslave them. This was the first great declaration on the subject; and, from the commencement of our economy till 1844, there stood this question in our Discipline: 'What shall be done for the extirpation of slavery?' It was asked, repeatedly and substantively, before all our Conferences, and the answer was: 'We are as much as ever convinced of the great evil of slavery.' That question and answer stood in our Discipline, and they were circulated East, West, North and South."

The claim of the Bishop, it will be observed, is not that the Church has been anti-slavery since the Southern Secession of 1844, but that it was *always* so. It was so, according to his solemn declaration, while Southern Methodists, with the exception, perhaps, of the travelling preachers, were no more restrained from buying, holding and selling slaves than from keeping cows, horses, or sheep, and while, as is well known, almost every lay Methodist at the South, who was *able* to be a slaveholder, *was* such. It was so, if we may believe the Bishop, when the Southern Conferences generally took the position that slavery was "not a moral evil," and were rebuked neither by the General Conference nor by the Bishops. It was so when the great body of Southern Methodist clergymen were shouting with the Rev. J. C. Postell, "SLAVERY IS BY DIVINE APPOINTMENT!" and with the Rev. Mr. Crowder, "GOD HIMSELF HAS IN SO MANY WORDS ENJOINED IT!" It was so when the whole power of the Church, North as well as South, was employed with more than Jesuitical skill in "crushing out" the anti-slavery movement; when the General Conference of 1836, which had no word of sympathy for the slave or of censure for the oppressor, turned the tide of its denunciation against two of its members for daring to attend an anti-slavery meeting, and when that of 1840 resolved that it was "inexpedient and unjustifiable for any preacher to permit coloured persons to give testimony against white persons" in slaveholding States; when Northern Conferences, at the instigation of the Bishops, refused to receive into the ministry any man, however eminent for piety and talent, unless he would first "*give a pledge that he would refrain from agitating the Church with* DISCUSSIONS *on slavery*"; when Hedding and Fisk were torturing the Golden Rule into an apology for slaveholding, and the *Christian Advocate and Journal* and the lesser organs of the Church were defending slavery out of the Bible and mingling their voices with those of profligate politicians in denouncing Abolitionists as madmen and incendiaries!

The Church is to be judged, according to Bishop Simpson, not by her *acts*, but by her *professions*. Though ten, twenty or even fifty thousand of her members hold slaves, breed them and traffic in them, as they do in swine, she is not *pro*-slavery, but *anti*-slavery, because, in accordance with a prescribed rule, she periodically asks herself, "What shall be done for the extirpation of slavery?" and with Pecksniffian self-complacency repeats, year after year, for answer, "We are as much as ever convinced of the great evil of slavery." This is a method of procuring indulgence for sin which the Pope of Rome, we venture to say, never dreamed of. The man who tattoos upon his breast the command, "Thou shalt not kill," and reads it piously at regularly recurring periods, is no murderer, though he slay his thousands! The thief who mumbles the Lord's prayer night and morning is *no* thief, though his house be crammed with stolen goods; a brothel, whose inmates periodically recite the decalogue and ask themselves, "What shall be done for the extirpation of" licentiousness? is *not* a brothel, but a Christian family! We wonder the Bishop did not, while he was about it, go a step farther and proclaim in the ears of his British brethren, that the people of the United States, inasmuch as they have declared in their Declaration of Independence that "all men are created equal," and incorporated certain "glittering and sounding generalities" in their Constitution, are not a slaveholding but an anti-slavery nation. That would have made a clean sweep not only of all accusations against the Methodist Church, but of those also which Abolitionists are wont to bring against other American sects.

It follows from the Bishop's argument that the *Southern* Methodist Church, if pro-slavery at all, is so not because her members breed, hold and sell slaves—for they do that no more now than they did before they seceded from the North—but only because, choosing no longer to play the hypocrite, they have struck from their Discipline the question, "What shall be done for the extirpation of slavery?" If that Church wishes to earn an anti-slavery character and put itself under the shelter of Bishop Simpson's robes, it need not emancipate a single slave, but only restore that *question* to its old place on the record!

Dr. McClintock pitched his tune to the same false key. In his final address to the British Conference he said:

"But in one of the letters addressed to the Conference in the public prints, begging, indeed, almost demanding, that Bishop Simpson and himself should be spurned from the door of the Conference, he found his Church charged with being in favour of slavery, because it had never enacted a rule excluding all slaveholders from its communion. But he would ask, Is there any Church in Christendom—leaving out the Quakers, and a few small bodies that had thus far obtained little influence, and were, in fact, hardly known in Church history—which has put such a law upon its statute-book? The Church of England has never done it; is the Church of England, therefore, pro-slavery? The Wesleyans in England have never done it; and are you, therefore, pro-slavery? So he might name the Presbyterian and all other of the great divisions of the Protestant army, both in Europe and America; and they were all in the same category."

We have not so mean an opinion of Dr. McClintock's intellect as to suppose for a moment that he was unconscious of the wretched sophistry of this plea. He knew perfectly well that his Church was not charged with being pro-slavery simply because she has never enacted a *rule* to exclude slaveholders, but because slavery actually exists and is tolerated, nay justified, within her pale. If slavery existed in England, and the English Churches were full of slaveholders, they would be *pro-slavery*, even though they had adopted a rule for their exclusion. The rule is nothing in itself, the pro-slavery or anti-slavery character of a Church depending not upon its recorded professions, but upon its acts. Anti-slavery Methodists in the United States ask for a rule of exclusion because slavery actually exists in the Church, and they seek authority to expel it. To argue against the necessity of such a rule in a slaveholding country because it has not been adopted in a land where slavery has no existence is an absurdity, so transparent that we wonder the English Methodists did not scout it with indignation. We fear they were only too willing to be deceived and misled as to their responsibility in receiving the American delegates.

GERRIT SMITH AMONG HIS NEW FRIENDS.

IT is instructive to observe the altered tone in which, since the "Compensated Emancipation" Convention at Cleveland, a certain class of journals are accustomed to speak of Gerrit Smith. While they regarded him as an uncompromising Abolitionist, they could scarcely mention his name without coupling it with some epithet of disparagement. That he was a *good* man, they pretended not to doubt; but they thought him singularly deficient in the high qualities of statesmanship—in short, little better than a downright fanatic and reckless agitator. Since his appearance at Cleveland as a champion of the Compensation scheme, they have suddenly discovered that he is as profoundly wise as he is confessedly eloquent—in short, as different from the unreasoning, impracticable and fanatical Abolitionists as gold is from tin. Their delight in praising him is matched only by the pleasure they evidently feel in denouncing some of his old friends, who cannot follow him in the support of the Compensation plan. The Ravenna (O.) *Democrat*, whose editor, though a Republican, is an inveterate hater of genuine Abolitionism, distributes its praise and its censure in a manner which we must regard as peculiarly edifying.

"By what we see reported in the Cleveland *Herald*, and by what we hear from private sources, we conclude the Hon. Gerrit Smith embraced the opportunity offered him in the 'Compensated Emancipation' Convention at Cleveland to shake off from him the ultra and damaging leeches which have so long hung upon him.

"He was assailed in the Convention by those whom his bounty has fed, his assailants speaking with much bitterness and coarseness against their kind patron, who has so long generously pensioned them upon his vast wealth. One of them, it is said, 'made a long speech denunciatory of the principles of the Convention, and taxing Gerrit Smith with inconsistency,' &c., &c.

"Mr. Smith bore all this with his accustomed magnanimity and forbearance, but took occasion to indicate that henceforth his line of action lay in a different direction, and that he should cease to be complicated with the movements of men of such a spirit.

"For instance, in alluding to his assailants on the floor of the Convention (a black man, Watkins, and a white man, Pryne), he said he knew not why he was selected to answer them, unless it was because he *formerly* acted with them—thus significantly intimating that he acted with them no longer.

"And again, he said: 'The speakers [his assailants] had been associates with him in anti-slavery movements *up to this point*, where, *unfortunately*, their PATHS DIVERGED.' A pretty distinct shaking off of the noisy and clamorous pretenders who have gained all the consequence they enjoy under the guise of reflecting his views. But great injustice and injury, we are satisfied, has been done to Mr. Smith by supposing that such irresponsible declaimers reflected his true sentiments, and Mr. Smith very properly, and very much to the gratification of his old admirers, has taken the first convenient opportunity to disabuse the public mind, and to place himself right in regard to those who have been falsely sailing under his flag, thus gaining a consideration which their own merits never would have given them."

The *Cleveland Herald*, another Republican paper of the compromising sort, while complimenting Mr. Smith, thus heaps abuse upon the men who had the courage to oppose his doctrine of compensation:

"As we expected, the entire afternoon was consumed in frothy, incoherent harangues by a couple of demagogues, in which not a single REASON was adduced why the system of 'Compensated Emaucipation' was wrong. The first speaker—a coloured brother (Watkins)—was fearful the cars had left him in consequence of his long speech, and the Convention heartily shared in the fear. The second speaker—a white man (Pryne)—inflicted a tedious, inflammatory and abusive speech on the Convention, of which the only tangible idea we could discover was that the time for 'retribution' had come, and that, instead of money, the slaveholder should be presented with the musket-ball and the bowie-knife. The selfish character of the abolition speakers was shown in the fact that, although it was well known the large audience assembled were drawn together with the expectation of hearing Gerrit Smith, yet they persisted in forcing their nauseating harangues on their unwilling hearers. The coloured speaker (Monroe) who followed repudiated with scorn and contempt the abolition professions of friendship for the slave, and exposed their selfishness and duplicity. The Convention did well in promptly repudiating the principles of the ultra abolition speakers, and would have done still better had it refused them the chance of wasting so much precious time."

The abuse of these journals is far more endurable than their praise. Mr. Smith has certainly got the worst end of the load. If he had gone to Cleveland as the champion of uncompromising Abolitionism, he would have been in no danger of winning panegyric from such sources. It is the step downward that commands the admiration of political compromisers and tricksters.

LETTER FROM A. M. POWELL.

CONVENTION AT BINGHAMTON.

BINGHAMTON, N. Y., Sept. 4, 1857.

To the Editors of The National Anti-Slavery Standard.

A CONVENTION just held at this place is the first of a series of Conventions and meetings to be held, under the auspices of the American Anti-Slavery Society, in Western and Central New York, during the months of September and October.

The Convention here assembled in Brigham Hall on Wednesday, Sept. 2, at 2 1-2 o'clock p. m.

WILLIAM MARVIN, Esq., of Binghamton, was chosen President. The audiences, though not large, were composed of an intelligent class of persons, who manifested a good degree of interest in the proceedings.

This, I believe, was the first Disunion Anti-Slavery Convention ever held here. The Convention was well advertised, but the people, most of them, seemed quite shy of us, though we had the friendly coöperation of some of the most intelligent and respectable citizens of the place.

There are numerous Churches here, of the various denominations, but none of the clergymen, save one Methodist (coloured), appeared among us. A worthy friend, who is well informed, assures me that if Rev. South-side Adams, D.D., or even Prime of the *New York Observer*, were to visit here, they would be readily admitted to the pulpit, and gladly listened to, by not a few.

In addition to WILLIAM WELLS BROWN and SUSAN B. ANTHONY, on Thursday, Rev. SAMUEL J. MAY, of Syracuse, was in attendance. His speech on Thursday afternoon, though delivered to a small audience, was an able and convincing one, in support of the Disunion doctrine. It was worthy of a much larger audience. In the evening Mr. May referred to the recent Cleveland Compensation Convention, and spoke of it as, in his view, an ill-advised and unhappy movement, to say the least; expressing, at the same time, much regret (in which I too can but share) that our friend Gerrit Smith should have given it his sanction and encouragement.

SOLOMON JUDD, Esq., a lawyer, of Binghamton, also made some remarks in our Convention, much in sympathy with the anti-slavery movement, though not entirely in favour of disunion.

On the whole, the Convention, though not numerously attended, is thought by friends residing here to have made a favourable commencement in the good work. Though we have passed from the dispensation of mobocratic violence in our meetings, there yet remains a great work to be done ere the people shall have become fully awakened to the magnitude and importance of the Anti-Slavery enterprise.

This place, as you may know, is the residence of the Hon. (!) DANIEL S. DICKINSON, a champion of the modern "Democracy," who, a few years ago, expressed *a regret that he had not been born in Virginia!* Of late, Mr. Dickinson has figured little in public as an active partisan. It is said that he has refused to accept office of Mr. Buchanan; and it is also rumoured that he is cherishing the hope of a future nomination for the Presidency by the "Democratic" party. A friend here, who has long been personally acquainted with Mr. Dickinson, and who speaks of him as an obliging neighbour and a good citizen, thinks he would make *almost as good a President as Franklin Pierce*, if not equal to Buchanan!

Binghamton has a very beautiful location in the valley of the Susquehanna. It is surrounded also by most interesting scenery. The country all along the New York and Erie Railroad is justly noted for the beauty and grandeur of its scenery.

From here we (Wm. Wells Brown, Susan B. Anthony and myself) go to Owego, Elmira and Corning, for Conventions, with meetings in the immediate vicinity of those places, some account of which I may give you in another letter. We are much indebted to Mr. Wm. Marvin for his efficient coöperation here; also to Messrs. Hawley and Clapp, and their families, for their kindness and hospitality. Yours, as ever, A. M. POWELL.

We find in the *Binghamton Republican* of the 3d inst. the following notice:

ANTI-SLAVERY CONVENTION.—This body met at Brigham Hall, in Binghamton, yesterday (Wednesday, September 2), and held a session in the afternoon and evening. Wm. Marvin, of this village, presided. The Convention was addressed by Susan B. Anthony, Aaron M. Powell, Wm. Wells Brown, a fugitive slave from Missouri, now of Boston, and others. The written address, in the evening, by Miss Anthony, was able and eloquent. The remarks and anecdotes of Mr. Brown, who is a bright and handsome mulatto, were exceedingly eloquent, humorous and interesting, showing clearly the white blood of his father, the "Coloured Doctor." He has much dramatic power, and a very agreeable voice and manner. Our citizens should turn out to hear him to-day; if they do not, they will lose a rich treat. Rev. Mr. May, of Syracuse, who was detained yesterday, is expected to be present to-day. The Convention will meet again this afternoon, at 2 1-2 o'clock, and in the evening.

POLITICS.

Ex-Senator Toucey, of Connecticut, is supposed to be an aspirant to the Presidency.

Several leading Democrats of Ohio, since the endorsement by their party of the Dred Scott decision, have joined the Republicans.

It is at length officially determined that Stewart, the Democratic candidate, is elected Governor of Missouri by 334 majority. The Republicans believe that this majority is the result of a fraudulent tampering with the returns.

Four hundred foreigners in Cleveland, Ohio, have signed a paper saying that they have heretofore unanimously voted the Democratic ticket, but that they shall stay away from the polls this Fall, alleging as a reason the election and appointment of Know-Nothings by the Democratic party and Administration.

The Bedford (Pa.) *Gazette*, speaking, no doubt, by authority, says:

"It has been intimated in certain quarters that Mr. Buchanan will be a candidate for reëlection to the Presidency in 1860. There is no foundation whatever for any such supposition. *We speak positively, and with a perfect knowledge of what we are doing*; when we say that under no circumstances, and in *no contingency*, will Mr. Buchanan be a candidate for re-nomination.

The *Evening Post*, replying to the charge of inconsistency brought against the Republicans by the Washington *Union*, on the ground that "nearly the whole party" in Iowa voted against coloured suffrage, says that paper "mistakes the issue which the Republicans make with the Administration, not only in Iowa, but in all the Northern States." In other words, the Republican party, as such, does not propose to claim equal rights for coloured men, even in the free States.

A Convention of Young Men favourable to the election of Mr. Banks for Governor was held at Worcester, Mass., on Tuesday. Mr. Banks himself made a speech, in which he declared his intention "*religiously* to support the Union of the States in the principles on which it was organized and the Constitution by which it is maintained"—rehearsed the old platitudes about non-interference with slavery in the States and "inflexible opposition to its extension"—and put one foot cautiously upon the Know-Nothing platform. Senator Wilson also addressed the Convention, warmly endorsing Mr. Banks as the man for the hour.

The *Cincinnati Gazette* repels with indignation the charge that Gov. Chase is an Abolitionist. It makes this broad declaration:

"*If the Republicans are Abolitionists at this day, they are precisely what the Democrats were in* 1850—NOTHING MORE. *The Republican platform of* 1857 *was the Democratic platform of* 1850, *so far as regards the question of slavery. There is not the shade of a shadow of difference between the two documents.*"

It was in 1850 that the Fugitive Slave law was enacted, by the combined influence of the Democratic and Whig parties; and now we are told that the party which calls itself Republican stands "precisely" where the Democratic party did at that time—"NOTHING MORE."

The "National Democracy" of Missouri adopted a platform, whereof two contiguous planks are as follows:

"Resolved, That we hold in detestation the anti-American and intolerant spirit which aims to curtail the privileges of those who, coming from other lands, seek to be citizens of the United States, and that the Democratic party of this State will, as it has ever done, frown indignantly on every attempt to interfere with the existing laws relative to naturalization.

"Resolved, That we are unalterably opposed to the extension of the right of suffrage to the negro race, and will never consent that the odious doctrine of negro equality shall find a place upon the statute-books of Wisconsin."

The *Courier and Enquirer* of this city holds a high place as a champion of the Republican party. Here is what its Washington correspondent says of the recent election in Iowa:

"The result of the election in Iowa is highly gratifying to the Republicans. The Constitution framed by a Convention controlled by that party has received a large majority, and the proposition to admit negroes to the right of suffrage has been voted down by 10,000 majority. *This latter decision proves better than volumes of argument the practical conservatism of the Republican party.* In that new and thriving State, without large cities, and with no considerable number of coloured persons to awaken sympathy or excite prejudice, the people have deliberately declined to admit the inferior race to an equality of political privileges. Negrophylism has no more a place in our political platform than in that of our opponents. Republicanism recognises its obligation to protect the coloured man from oppression, but *does not shock popular prejudices, whether reasonable or unreasonable, by giving him rights which he could not maintain.*"

The contest between Messrs. Hunter and Wise for the U. S. Senatorship of Virginia waxes hotter every day. Hunter's friends are attacking Wise on the ground that, while he was Minister at Brazil (during the Tyler Administration), he was distinguished for his opposition to the slave trade, getting many American slavers condemned. In 1844, the slaveholders, while plotting to extend and perpetuate slavery by the power of the National Government, affected the warmest zeal for the suppression of the slave trade, intending in this way to blind and mislead the North; *now* the standard of slaveholding orthodoxy demands the vindication of the foreign as well as the domestic traffic in human flesh, and the "Delphic words" uttered by Gov. Wise, *in the service of the Slave Power*, thirteen years ago, are now paraded as a proof of his unsoundness! His friends meet the charge in a way which shows that they fear its effect upon his prospects.

David Wilmot is vigorously engaged in "stumping" the State of Pennsylvania as the Republican candidate for Governor. At Bedford, a correspondent of one of the Republican papers informs us, "Judge Wilmot seemed to be sensible that he had to encounter a certain degree of prejudice, and at once manfully met it by exposing the wilful misrepresentations to which he had been habitually subjected, in being denounced as an Abolitionist." To show that he was *not* an Abolitionist, he told the people that, "as a States Rights Republican, *his* doctrine was that Congress had no power to interfere with the social institutions of the States; that slavery was a municipal regulation, which every State must determine for itself, as Pennsylvania had done when she abolished it three-quarters of a century ago. The States were the independent guardians of their own policy, and one had no right to intrude upon any regulation of another. With the Territories belonging to the General Government the question was wholly different, and to that he had and would continue persistently to address himself, however others might falter or consent to kiss the rod that smote them." It is remarkable, certainly, that Mr. Wilmot, in attempting to mark the line of separation between himself and the Abolitionists, should begin by proclaiming as his the precise doctrine which they have held and enunciated for twenty-five years. We wish he were equally sound upon other points of the anti-slavery creed.

THE JERRY RESCUE ANNIVERSARY will be celebrated at Syracuse on Thursday (not Tuesday, as erroneously stated last week), Oct. 1st. The official call will be found in another column. On the preceding Tuesday and Wednesday the American *

COLOURED SUFFRAGE.—The amendment to the Constitution of New York, initiated by the last Legislature, for abolishing the property qualification now required of coloured voters, has been defeated for the time being in a way not anticipated, we presume, by anybody. To perfect the amendment, it is required that it shall be published for three months previous to the choice of the next Legislature (see Art. 13, Sec. 1, Constitution of 1846). It must then pass the Legislature again, and be finally submitted to a vote of the people, when, if approved, it becomes a part of the Constitution. The Albany *Evening Journal* gives the following explanation:

"These resolutions, and five other joint resolutions, were sent from the Senate with bills requiring the approval of the Governor. The private secretary, separating the resolutions from the bills, placed the latter before the Governor, and, by inadvertence, laid the former aside, instead of returning them to the Senate or sending them to the office of the Secretary of State, where they belonged. Overlooked, in the hurry of business, they have lain unobserved ever since. These resolutions were sent, improperly, but unintentionally, by a deputy clerk of the Senate, to the Executive Chamber, where, by an unintentional oversight of the Governor's secretary, they have remained until the object of their passage has been temporarily defeated. The Governor had not seen the resolutions until to-day, and did not know they were in his Chamber.

"We need not say how sincerely this mistake is deplored. While each and all who are directly or remotely responsible for it will accuse themselves of a want of thoughtfulness, none will impute intentional wrong, in act or motive, to either or any of them; for it is well known that these resolutions had the approval, in sentiment and sympathy, of the Governor and his secretary, and of the Senate and its officers."

The Democratic journals affect to believe that the resolutions were designedly suppressed by the connivance of the Republican leaders, to avoid the responsibility of the issue presented by them in the approaching election. This *may* be true, but we shall not believe it without stronger evidence than has yet been offered.

THE *American Presbyterian* is the Philadelphia organ of the New School Presbyterian Church Though the Rev. Albert Barnes is one of its associate editors, its anti-slavery is an infinitesimal quantity—so diluted, in fact, as to be scarcely discernible. Since the Southern secession, it has laboured incessantly to quiet the fears of the pro-slavery party on the border and keep them from going over to Dr. Ross. It has contended that, in spite of appearances and the complaints of the slaveholders, the action of the Cleveland Assembly did not amount to much—was nothing more, in fact, than a reiteration of old Presbyterian doctrine. It is believed that, if the chloroform had not been thus constantly held to the nostrils of the New School Presbyterians of Philadelphia, half of them, at least, would have joined the Southern Secession. When the story of Col. Netherland's brutality to his slaves came out, the *American Presbyterian* gladly gave it currency, because it was calculated to check the Southern proclivities of Philadelphia Presbyterians. It seems, however, that one of the associate editors did not relish this disclosure, and, to relieve himself of responsibility, issued the following card in the subsequent number:

A CARD.—In the *American Presbyterian*, of August 20th, there appeared an article under the caption, "Slavery in East Tennessee; Delegates to the Richmond Convention," consisting of a statement by Rev. Samuel Sawyer and of editorial comments thereupon. The article referred to was published whilst the undersigned was absent from the city, and without his sanction or knowledge. Disapproving wholly of such articles and believing that this one, though not intended, is yet adapted to throw odium on Southern Christians, and so to add to, rather than to lessen, sectional prejudices, the undersigned avails himself of the courtesy of his associates to disclaim, in this method, any, the least, connection with the matter.

August 26th, 1857. THOMAS J. SHEPHERD.

Is it not a hardship that a Presbyterian saint at the South cannot "larrup his nigger," and be sustained by his brethren in his efforts to enforce wholesome discipline upon his plantation, without exposing himself to the censures of religious presses at the North?

KENTUCKY.—Mr. Fee, in his letter on the first page, calls upon anti-slavery men in the free States to emigrate to Kentucky, to aid in abolishing slavery. The Newport *News*, on the other hand, informs us that "some of the anti-slavery men in Kentucky are offering their real estate at about one-half its value, in order to get away from the country." They are moved to do this, we suppose, in consequence of the late brutal mob in Rockcastle County. Of the men concerned in that mob the *News* gives us the following information:

"From one who was an eye-witness to it we learn that nearly all, if not all, of them were a low class of drunken rowdies, most of whom were very drunk upon these mob occasions. If the pro-slavery men are willing to claim these as their friends, they must not blame us for saying that the association is eminently proper and fit to be made. It is true, as we stated in another article, that the 'peculiar institution' looks to this kind of influence for protection and defence, and the *Courier's* classification corroborates our statement.

"Everything defends its kind; every bad quality has its associate, every vice its companion. The robber and the burglar defend their brethren in crime, and slavery tries to profit by their example; friends in vice, friends in crime and friends in enslaving humanity.

"Another fact, also, of which we have before spoken, is confirmed by the Louisville *Courier*, and shows that determined ignorance is a friend to their cause. Of the outrages in Rockcastle and the adjacent counties, *the papers in the State preserved the most profound silence.* The *Courier* was the only one, we believe, outside of Newport, that spoke of them, and it doubted the facts because, as it said, 'no paper of that section had said anything about it.' So it is, drunkenness and ignorance are slavery's best friends and defenders."

RESIGNATION OF JUDGE CURTIS.—The Hon. Benjamin R. Curtis, of Boston, has resigned his seat on the bench of the United States Supreme Court. The Boston *Courier*—a paper likely to be well informed—says "he has been led to take this step from reasons growing out of his private affairs." It is confidently asserted in some quarters that he found the salary ($6,000) inadequate, and it is believed by many that his place on the bench was made uncomfortable on account of his unwillingness to construe the Constitution in accordance with the desires of the ruling party. He was appointed in 1851 as the successor of Judge Woodbury, and there is no doubt that he was selected on account of his zealous defence of Webster's apostacy and his well-known advocacy of the Fugitive Slave law. If, as his opinion in the Dred Scott case would seem to indicate, the later movements of the Slave Power have disgusted him, we trust he will never be able to blind his conscience to the fact that those movements are the natural and inevitable fruits of the Union-saving measures of 1850. It was then that the North placed herself in fresh degradation under the heel of the Slave Oligarchy, and, next to Mr. Webster, Judge Curtis may be said to be responsible for the deed.

Various candidates for the vacant place are mentioned, but we expect it will be filled by that wily and unscrupulous demagogue, Caleb Cushing.

MR. CURTIS'S ORATION.—It is hardly necessary to call the attention of the reader to the oration of Mr. George William Curtis, which may be found on the fourth page of our this week's paper. Were it not attractive for its charming style, and refreshing as a College address with some sort of life, and reality, and earnestness in it, it would command the attention of old-fashioned Abolitionists as a clear statement, set forth with graceful eloquence, of the principles which they cherish and live by, and which have forced them into the relation to the Constitution and the Union which they have maintained for the last dozen years. Mr. Curtis is a Garrisonian without knowing it.

While referring to this address, we take the opportunity to express our regret at an inadvertent statement made by us, a few weeks ago, to the effect that President Lord left the platform on its delivery at Dartmouth. We were misled by a careless statement of a friend, who himself misunderstood the statement of another who observed the bearing and manner of Dr. Lord on leaving the platform at the close of the oration. It was very evident that he had heard nothing to please him, and one can easily understand, after following Mr. Curtis through his exposition of the Higher Law, that a High Priest of the Lower Law must have sat in an uneasy seat while listening to it.

PERIODICAL NEW TESTAMENT.—We have already spoken of the project of the Rev. Thomas H. Stockton, of Philadelphia, to publish in separate tracts, periodically, the several books of the New Testament. The publication has already commenced with the Gospel of Matthew, the text being printed in paragraphs, marking the change of subjects, instead of being broken abruptly and arbitrarily into verses, while, for convenience, the verse divisions in common use are noted by figures in the margin. An index of all the important contents of the book is affixed, by which the reader will be able to find in a moment any part of the record which he may wish to consult. Horne's Introduction, revised by Tregelles, and three pictorial illustrations (Nelson's coloured prints) are presented in an appendix. The illustrations are, 1, A Chart of Jerusalem; 2, View of Jerusalem from the North-west; 3, View of the Mount of Olives. The type is clear and beautiful, the paper white and strong, the page 18mo size. The price of the book, in flexible covers, gold-stamped and gilt-edged, is 40 cts., for which it will be sent, unrolled and smooth, post free. Address Rev. T. H. Stockton, 535 Arch street, Philadelphia.

MR. BUCHANAN'S LETTER.—The Washington *Union* of the 3d inst. gives the following paragraph:

"We have been requested by Mr. Horatio King to say that he was not only totally ignorant, but he had not the slightest suspicion of the character of the communication from Prof. Silliman and others to the President; that it came to him through the mail from a person unknown to him, accompanied by a respectful note requesting him to see it safely delivered to the President; and that he accordingly sent it, together with said note, to the President's private secretary, stating in a note also to the secretary that he was ignorant of the contents of the package."

The anxiety of Mr. King to avert the suspicion that he was cognisant of the character of the communication sent to his care affords a striking illustration of the degrading conditions upon which Northern men are permitted to hold office at Washington. Unquestionably, if he had been aware of the contents of the letter, and with such knowledge had dared to send it to its destination, he would have been turned out of his place as an unfaithful servant of slavery.

CONVENTIONS IN NEW YORK.—It will be seen that our indefatigable friends, Susan B. Anthony, Aaron M. Powell and William Wells Brown, have commenced a new lecturing campaign in this State, as Agents of the American Anti-Slavery Society. They need no word of commendation from us, being known by their works in almost every part of the State; but we cannot refrain from urging our friends, in the places they may visit, to lend them a helping hand, especially in extending notice of their meetings, inducing their friends and neighbours to attend, and contributing to the Treasury of the Society to the utmost of their ability.

LITTELL'S LIVING AGE, No. 694, opens with a critical notice of the life and writings of Isaac Watts, from the *North British Review*. Among the other contents of the number we notice with regret a most unfair and bitter onslaught on Spiritualism, by Prof. Felton. It is not creditable to *The Living Age* that while it carefully suppresses the evidence in favour of Spiritualism, it should give currency to misrepresentation and caricature on the other side. We say this not at all in the interest of Spiritualism, but as friends of justice and fair play all round.

THE OHIO ANNIVERSARY.—Our friend JOEL MCMILLAN, just arrived from Salem, brings gratifying intelligence of the Anniversary of the Western Anti-Slavery Society, lately held at Alliance. He was present on the first two days, and says the meetings were large and spirited. On Sunday particularly, the number in attendance was greater than at any other anniversary for several years past, and the speaking of the best sort. We hope to receive a further report next week.

CALL FOR A NORTHERN CONVENTION.

Whereas it must be obvious to all that the American Union is constantly becoming more and more divided, by Slavery, into two distinct and antagonistic nations, between whom harmony is impossible, and even ordinary intercourse is becoming dangerous;

And whereas Slavery has now gained entire control over the three branches of our National Government, Executive, Judiciary and Legislative; has so interpreted the Constitution as to deny the right of Congress to establish freedom even in the Territories, and by the same process has removed all legal protection from a large portion of the people of the free States, and has inflicted, at many times and places, outrages far greater than those which our fathers rose in arms to repel;

And whereas there seems no probability that the future will, in these respects, be different from the past, under existing State relations;

The undersigned respectfully invite their fellow-citizens of the Free States to meet in Convention, at ————, in October, 1857, to consider the practicability, probability, and expediency of a separation of the Free and Slave States, and to take such other measures as the condition of the times may require.

LEGAL VOTERS.	OTHER PERSONS.

Names to be returned to J. A. Howland, Worcester, Mass.

Summary.

ART CRITICISM.—An elderly Pennsylvania woman, with her daughter, looking at the marble statue of Girard, in the College building, the other day, startled the bystanders by exclaiming: "La, Sally, how white he was!"

Messrs. D. Appleton & Co., have in press a volume by Col. Benton, on the Dred Scott case, and the decision of the Supreme Court. The author takes ground against the majority of the judges, and, we dare say, sustains his views with his accustomed vigour and learning.

JENNY LIND.—Mr. Otto Goldschmidt, the husband of Jenny Lind, is at present in England, making arrangements for the removal thither of his family, which is passing the Summer at the village of Oberlossnitz, near Dresden, and has recently been increased by the birth of a daughter. Mrs. Lind Goldschmidt's voice, it is said, has neither lost in quantity nor in quality, and she would not refuse the offer of another musical tour through the United States.

FREE PASSES.—A fireman on the New York Central Railroad asked the Superintendent for a pass, which he declined to give, saying, "The company employ you and pay you so much for your services, and there our trade ends. If you were at work for a farmer at a dollar a day, and wanted to go to Saratoga, would you expect him to hitch up his team and take you there for nothing?"

The fireman answered: "No, sir; but if he had his team hitched up, and was going directly to Saratoga, I should think he was a d——d hog if he didn't let me ride."

HARRISBURG, Va., *August* 20, 1857.—Garrett King, an Irishman, living in the "Ridge," near this place, was arrested on Friday evening last, the 28th ult., on the charge of harbouring a slave, the property of George E. Deneale, Esq., and lodged in the jail of this county. The negro made his escape from Mr. Deneale on Wednesday last, and was going through the woods near King's house, when King told him to come in, that he would keep him for a week if he wished to stay. On Thursday, Mr. Deneale offered a reward of $25 for the apprehension of the negro in the county, when King brought him to town and claimed the reward. The negro then made these disclosures.—*The South.*

MR. EDITOR: Having read your paper considerable for the last sixteen years, I have come to this conclusion, that an Abolitionist is like unto a beetlebug, endeavouring to pass through the glass window at night, for light. Slavery must work out its own salvation, wherever it exists. This is the soul's truth, in all things. BUMP.

"BUMP" has not appended his true signature: it should be "GUMP"—for the conclusions to which he has come, after reading our paper for so long a period, indicate "a plentiful lack" of understanding on his part, &c. as to render any attempt to enlighten him a hopeless undertaking. We must, therefore, let him "slide."—*Liberator.*

The Boston *Post* has a story of a facetious railroad conductor: "A lady who had a boy with her, considerably above the half-paying age, attempted the rather difficult exploit (in the anti-crinoline period) of hiding her precious son under her skirts. 'Uncle John,' who saw more bulk than he could account for by any ordinary theory of personal enlargement, carefully reconnoitered the pile, and, guessing the secret of the lady's extraordinary expansion, proceeded, without saying a word, to collect fare for one passenger and a half, and gave the lady her change, which, without looking it over, she put in her pocket. By-and-bye, observing that the boy was still kept in 'durance vile,' 'Uncle John' humanely whispered in her ear, 'You may as well let him out—*you've paid for both!*'"

"CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES.—Like one of those wondrous rocking stones reared by the Druids, which the finger of a child may vibrate to the centre, yet the might of an army could not move it from its place, our Constitution is so nicely poised and balanced that it seems to sway with every breath of opinion, yet so firmly rooted in the hearts and affections of the people that the wildest storms of treason and fanaticism break over it in vain."

There is a vain boast in the above which we do not like. Unless we speedily repent of our national sins, our Constitution will not avert from us the Divine displeasure, or save us from ruin. Other nations have had as much confidence in their destiny, their stability and perpetuity as we now have, yet their glory and their power have passed away.—*Congregational Herald.*

We often hear of singular cases of gratitude, which show human nature to be better than many would have us believe. Here is the last case: At the time of the Abolition riots, in 1838, in Philadelphia, the Orphans' Asylum for Coloured Children was fired. Through the exertions of the Good Will engine the building was partially saved from the flames, and the lives of its inmates rescued from a devouring element, and a furious mob. On Friday evening last a coloured man, neatly attired, entered the house of the Good Will Engine Company and desired to see some of the members. Having introduced himself to them, he stated that, nineteen years since, through their exertions, while an inmate of the Coloured Asylum, his life was preserved. He then presented them with a silver goblet, valued at forty dollars, as a testimony of his undying esteem.

FEMALE MEDICAL COLLEGE.—The Eighth Annual Report of the New England Female Medical College presents a very encouraging state of things. The number of students for the term of 1856-57 was 28; of graduates, seven. The $10,000 required to be raised, in order to secure a like amount from the State, has been contributed. The property now belonging to the College is over $20,000. Mrs. Waterhouse, of Cambridge, has presented $1,000 towards endowing a Professorship of Anatomy. The Institution is much in need of a Hospital building, where female patients can have the attendance of skilful physicians of their own sex. By the State grant of $1,000 a year, forty students are entitled to free tuition in the College. These scholarships expire in 1859. Applications for the n should be made to the Secretary, Samuel Gregory, M. D., Boston. The receipts for the past year were $6,493 71; the expenses, $3,993 72. The balance, $2,500, is the first instalment of the State grant of $10,000. It is proposed to employ the whole of this towards purchasing a College building.

LYNCHING EXTRAORDINARY.—The Milwaukee *Sentinel* gives an interesting lynching case which occurred recently at Geneva, in that State. Several young ladies have been in the habit of bathing in a beautiful cove formed by Geneva lake, and nearly concealed by dense shrubbery. One S——, a booby of 22, who lives with farmer G. in the capacity of "help," informed some of his mates that "curiosities may be seen there, cheaper and better than at the circus," and, for his part, he "would go to the show!" This being reported to some of the fair ones, they resolved to give him a lesson. While some of the more juvenile members of the group made *apparent* preparations for the bath, a committee of full-grown feminines searched the thicket, and found like, placed very conveniently for *peeping*. To seize and strip him was the work of a few moments, and the hazel bushes which had formed his hiding place became rods of justice in the hands of his captors. "Served him right."

THE INDIANA NEGRO LAW UNCONSTITUTIONAL.—There is a law in the statutes of Indiana which provides that after the 1st of November, 1851, no negro or mulatto shall be entitled to come into or settle in the State under penalty of a heavy fine. This law has been practically a dead letter, and in no case has a conviction ever been had under it. A few days since a negro woman of this city complained of a negro girl under the law in question. She was arrested and confined in jail. On Tuesday she was brought before Judge Anderson, of the Common Pleas Court, on a writ of habeas corpus. It was claimed by the girl's attorneys, Messrs. Wilson and Keer, that the law was unconstitutional, for the reason that the subject matter of the bill was not expressed in the title, as the Constitution provides. The title of the act is "An Act to enforce the thirteenth Article of the Constitution." Judge Anderson decided the law unconstitutional, and discharged the prisoner.—*N. A. Tribune.*

CALUMNY REFUTED.—The London Missionary Society, which has had a fine opportunity to examine the workings of West India emancipation, makes the following declaration in its last Annual Report:

"In the West Indies the old and oft-repeated calumny is refuted, that starvation is the only corrective for negro indolence, and the whip the only effectual stimulus to exertion. There we behold our former slaves, by honest industry acquiring, in many instances, the possessions of men by whom they were regarded but as goods and chattels; and we see them, expending the fruits of their toil, not as their owners often did, in the gratification of low vices, but for the support of their Christian teachers, and in securing for their children the blessings of instruction."

OVER NINETY SLAVES EMANCIPATED.—We learn that by the last will and testament of Mrs. H. H. Coalter (relict of Judge John Coalter), of Stafford County, who died last week, some ninety-two negroes have been freed. The provision of the will is to take effect on the 1st of January next. Charles, her favourite man servant, receives his freedom at once, and an annuity of $100 for life, and sufficient money to take him to such State or country as he may elect to live in. For the balance, the executors are to ascertain what fund will be sufficient to provide the usual outfit for removing them to Liberia or any other free State or country in which they may elect to live. The will further provides that if any of the servants shall prefer to remain in Virginia, instead of accepting the foregoing provisions, they are permitted to select a master from among the relatives of the deceased.—*The South.*

RUNAWAY NEGROES CAPTURED.—Two black girls, owned by Hugh Nichols, Esq., ran off from Wheeling, on Saturday, and succeeded in gaining a crossing of the river at West Wheeling ferry. The alarm having been given, immediate pursuit was made, and the runaways were taken up on the Ohio side, between Bridgeport and Martinsville, by friends of Mr. N., who was absent from home. They had been enticed away by his boy Dave, who absconded a few months since, but last week returned at night to his master's house, and, after stealing a vest and $22, made arrangements for the contemplated escape of the girls. Dave has been harboured during the harvest months by an Abolitionist of Belmont County, Ohio, who, doubtless, prompted him to this new devilry, in persuading the wenches to leave a good home, where they had from childhood been treated as members of the family.—*The South, 6th.*

A cool proceeding is an advertisement in the St. Louis *Republican*, from W. F. Myrich, Sheriff of Mississippi County, Missouri, that he committed to the jail of said county "a negro man calling himself James Broustead, who says he is free," and who was taken up by the Missouri sheriff at *Cairo, Illinois!* This is already been settled by the Dred Scott decision, or some other modern patent adjudication, that free coloured men may be taken away from the free States, placed in slave State jails, to be sold (as is the usual practice) into slavery to pay their jail fees? We have thought it hard enough that a coloured freeman could be arrested on any pretended suspicion of any rascally officer in a slave State who wishes to make a fee, and compelled, though previously free, to pay the fee or be sold into slavery. This is a great iniquity.—*Phil. Morning Times, Sept.* 2.

MARRIAGE OF SLAVES.—The clergy of the slave States, who are not utterly destitute of all conscience, have a rather difficult task to perform, to acquit themselves of their obligations to the slaveholders and to their own consciences in the question of marriage of slaves. Some of the South Carolina clergymen are now engaged in resolving these difficulties. At the late Convention of the Episcopal Church in South Carolina, it was resolved that, "in consideration of the many and serious difficulties arising out of the marriage relation among slaves, and the perplexing questions which thus force themselves upon Christian men, and especially upon Christian ministers, a committee of seven be appointed to prepare a report, defining when and in what circumstances a clergyman may lawfully unite any two slaves in marriage." We shall wait to see whether they adopt the course recommended by a New England slaveholder of early times, to "*marry them just a leetle.*" We see no other way of compromising.—*Bugle.*

ENGLISH GOSSIP.—We take the following from a London letter dated Aug. 22:

"Tennyson is at the Lakes, in ill health, to which, I fear, his *opium-eating* habits have not a little contributed. Dickens, with his amateur troupe, has had a perfect ovation in cotton-spinning Manchester. The first number of Thackeray's new serial is to appear on the 1st of November, and to be entitled 'The Virginians,' which sounds as if American scenery and character were to figure in it. The first three volumes of Carlyle's 'Frederick the Great' are in the press; the matter has accumulated on him as he proceeded, and this is but an instalment of what he himself considers his *magnum* (or *maximum*) *opus*. I must add that among literary notabilities who have become converts to Spiritualism is now to be named Elizabeth Barrett Browning, the poetess, recently enriched by the munificent bequest of John Kenyon, and whose little son, a boy of nine, is (as becomes the child of a poet father and mother) a perfect marvel of precocity in music and song."

POWER OF NON-RESISTANCE.—*Moneka, Kansas, Aug.* 11, 1857. Please publish the enclosed for the benefit of the public—the world at large. I look upon it as one of the most concise, pointed and *eloquent* sentences in the English language:

"MR. JOHN O. WATTLES—*Sir:* Here is your watch. Damn your non-resistance—I can't stand it. I have travelled more than one hundred miles. "Your friend, J. H."

On my return from Sabbath school and Bible class, last Sunday, I found my watch returned, and the above note accompanying it.

There is a sentence, in an old book—now nearly out of fashion—which says: "When a man's ways please the Lord, he maketh his enemies to be at peace with him."

As ever, for God and Humanity,

—*Kansas Herald of Freedom.* JOHN O. WATTLES.

IN TOWN WITH A POCKET FULL OF ROCKS.—A Tennessee planter lately visited New Orleans, and stopped at the St. Charles hotel, and in the course of a week created a prodigious sensation. He was a stout, plain-looking old fellow, and on the trip down from Memphis contrived to get very drunk, so that, from the time he landed in the city until he left, he carried on like a crazy man, paying fifty or a hundred times the value of everything he bought. He gave a coloured barber $20 for shaving him, and refused to take any change; paid half a dollar for a glass of liquor, declined the change, and gave the barkeeper $20 additional as a free gift. On the latter being rejected, the planter crumpled up the bill, threw it behind the counter, and walked off in a rage. He had all his pockets stuffed with bank notes of the denominations of hundreds, fifties and twenties, which he threw away recklessly. If he ran against a person, he dashed a handful of bills in his face. Not satisfied with this, he afterwards paraded about with a linen bag so full of silver that it beat him down to carry it. Wherever he had a chance he paid for drinks, &c., with a handful of half dollars. After a three days' tour of this description, he packed up and travelled back to Tennessee, where he belonged. He is said to be quite wealthy. The suckers about town are believed to have reaped a grand harvest out of this poor inebriate's folly.

A FAITHLESS UNDERGROUND R. R. CONDUCTOR.—We have been shown a letter from Kentucky, and by a Kentuckian known to the facts, charging a white man of this town with getting sums of money from slaves to bring them away, pocketing their money and then leaving them to their fate. We have the names of parties thus robbed and the sums they gave him, amounting to over three hundred dollars in all. The letter referred to is dated Aug. 5th, and, before giving names and amounts, says: "There is a man just getting rich off the slaves by getting their money and doing nothing for them. I mention this that you may have the gentleman attended to." Then follows his name, &c. We know of no amount of censure or punishment too severe for one thus guilty; a man to hold out prospects of aid to the manacled slave, and then, after having pocketed his funds, on pretence of helping him, to leave him, stripped of the little all he had carefully and through much difficulty saved, for the purpose of escaping from his wretched lot, no moral gibbet is too high for the living wretch, no measure of rebuke, however severe, is too great for him. We throw out this hint for his especial benefit, as further proof of his guilt is at hand, we have been told.—*Provincial (Chatham, C. W.) Freeman, Aug.* 25.

BAD NEWS FROM LIBERIA.—The New York *Commercial Advertiser* says that information has been received at the Methodist Episcopal Mission Rooms in that city that there are apprehensions of a general famine in Liberia; that already several of the poorer people have died of starvation; that some of the missionaries on the country stations are without any other food than green plums, and that around some of the settlements the natives are cutting down the palm trees, for the sake of the palm cabbage, to sustain life. The Rev. J. W. Horne, who gives this information, says that this state of things has been coming upon them for years, and is due to the great number of idle and worthless persons in the community who will not work, which number is constantly increased by immigration from the United States, and to the failure of the rice crops several years ago, owing, mainly, to the attendance of the natives upon the "Devil Bush," when they should have been on their farms. The rice that has been gathered for a year or two past has not been enough for food, so that none has been saved for sowing. Mr. Horne says that the distress is not confined to the natives, and he predicts a still worse condition of things. The *Commercial*, however, thinks that things are not quite so bad, and that Mr. Horne has felt something of the pressing effects of the climate if ever, under which he has been suffering.—*Boston Traveller.*

AN AMALGAMATION RIOT.—A report has been circulated among the Irish people of the upper wards of Jersey City that an Irishwoman, named Elizabeth Daniel, had been united in the bonds of matrimony to a mulatto sailor, named John Brawery. He is so light-coloured that the traces of the negro are not easily perceived. A mob of Irish men and women, to the amount of nearly three hundred, collected about the house of Thomas Doyle, at the corner of Monmouth and South Eighth streets (who is a brother-in-law of Miss Daniels), on Wednesday evening, to vent their indignation upon the pair, who are residing for the present in Doyle's family. The ringleaders of the riot invited Brawery to come out and "treat the party." Mr. B. took a survey of the party, and declined the undertaking. The mob then assailed the house with a shower of stones, breaking all of the windows and terribly alarming the inmates, who expected to be murdered by the furious mob. Three policemen, hearing the tumult, approached and attempted to disperse the mob, but without success. Officer Robinson received a blow on the eye, from a stone which was probably aimed at the building. The police received accessions to the force until there were twelve of them, when they dispersed the crowd and made one arrest. The Rev. J. Kelley, pastor of the Roman Catholic Church, published a card yesterday, stating that they have not been married. The people in the neighbourhood, however, insist that they are married. It is not probable that there will be any further trouble.—*Trib., Sept.* 4.

THE DROWNED BOY AND THE CLAIRVOYANT.—A day or two since we chronicled the death, by drowning, at Chelsea, of a boy of nine years, son of Mr. Samuel Ward, the foreman of the Chelsea Dye House. A well known State street business man makes the following statement, which we give as related: When the boy was first missing, and before it was known what had become of him, a friend of the parent went to J. V. Mansfield, of No. 3 Winter street, known as the "Letter-Writing Medium," and, placing a letter securely sealed upon his desk to prevent deception, asked an answer to the letter, which in fact contained a request for information regarding the lost boy. Without opening it, the medium wrote a reply as follows:

"The one you seek is not present, but I come to answer your question. You will search all that the boy Ward; you did not see him below will have gone in his little hand. I think all will come right and shortly his body will be restored to his anxious father. Should he be in the water then I could not see him, as we cannot see well in the water. I will look again."

At this moment a Miss Munson, who is another clairvoyant physician of the same locality, was asked by Mr. Mansfield to try and ascertain what the friend of Mr. Ward wished, and she was placed in the trance state without any knowledge of what the gentleman desired, when she gave the following information, and also described the boy and his dress:

"You are in search of a little boy. He is in the water and dead. He lies on his back, with his hand raised nearly as high as his face"—then remarked: "The spirit of the boy is on the wharf, looking toward the body, as if guarding it. They are now reaching him; they will have the body before you return to Chelsea."

The gentleman in question, in since stating the particulars of the finding of the body, says they found it in the attitude described by the clairvoyant, and the description given of the dress was very accurate.—*Boston Traveller.*

PERMUTATION TYPOGRAPH.—Since our former notice of Mr. Livermore's ingenious invention, many scientific and practical men have examined it, and it is everywhere regarded as a contrivance of remarkable promise. To write with perfect legibility in every letter and figure, without using one's eyes—in the dark, in the cars, standing in the dense and jostling crowd, and without attracting notice—with all your materials and your manuscript besides concealed and protected within a box conveniently carried in the pocket—the very conception is strikingly original and bold, and equally striking is the ingenuity with which the thought has been realized. Authors, travellers, artists, business agents, observers and notice-takers of all classes, who wish to minute down facts and impressions at the moment, will find it invaluable. Hereafter there will be no need for such purposes of note-books and pencils, or of writing at home from recollection. And the writing is legible and permanent, and in a conveniant form to send to the printer, and put into an envelope for a friend. The story of a day is written as you walk or ride; and, at its close, instead of spending a weary evening with pen and ink, you have to take your strip of paper from the box, and mail it, clean and neat as a printed page, for your wife or your employer. But we will not attempt to imagine its whole sphere.

Some may suppose that it must be difficult to learn to use the "Typograph." This is a mistake. A single day is ample time for one of ordinary tact to master the art, although to write with great rapidity requires, of course, considerable experience. Some of the letters vary in their form from those in common use; but the variations are so slight that, with a very little practice, the writing is read with the greatest ease.

The method of forming the letter is very simple, but remarkably ingenious, and upon this method depends the simplicity of the construction, and the practical success of the machine. The twenty-six letters of the alphabet, the punctuation marks and numerals, are all formed by the operation of six keys. To form any single letter requires but one movement of the hand, and this movement also secures the other requisite movements of the paper and type, so as to form regular lines, with equal distance from each other.—*Vermont Chronicle.*

ORIGIN OF INDIAN WARS.—The *Capital City Fact*, issued at Columbus, Ohio, gives the following account of the origin of our two latest Indian troubles:

"In regard to the origin of the affair at Spirit Lake, we have the following from a reliable source. The son of a chief, with a band of seventeen warriors, had a misunderstanding with the main body of their nation. Owing to this domestic quarrel, they did not plant corn last summer on their reserve, and the agent made this a pretext for withholding their annuities last fall. It is not known what the agent did with it, but the Indians did not get it. Early in the spring, this poor starved band came near the settlement, and a dog fell upon them, which, in self-defence, they killed. For this they were deprived of their arms, severely beaten, and driven away by the settlers.

"Last winter, it is well known, was unusually severe and the game scarce. These miserable Indians had no alternative but to perish or steal. Is it surprising that, in their extremity, they chose the latter? When this was known, the *civilized* whites formed a company, armed, pursued these outcasts, and shot down several of them. This provoked and drove them to desperation, and resulted in the burnings and massacres that followed.

"The history of the case on the Plains, as we gather it from the public press, is briefly this: Last fall, the mail-carrier, a few miles from Fort Laramie, was fired upon. He returned to the fort, reporting an attack from the Indians. Forthwith a company of dragoons were on their horses, and soon came on an encampment. They fired and killed eleven Indians, burned their camp, captured twenty ponies and returned to the fort. The Indians that escaped this murderous outrage, being desperate, soon after fell upon a party of emigrants, took their teams and captured two women and killed several men. Thus commenced the Cheyenne war, which, as it appears by late accounts, is not yet ended.

"Early this summer, Col. Sumner went after this tribe. He divided his force into two companies, many miles apart, and the Indians outgeneralled him by getting between the two divisions; and while he was seeking to destroy them, they destroyed Babbitt and his party."

DICKINSON AMONG THE PROPHETS.—*Cortland, Aug.* 29, 1857.—A funny scene occurred in court here a day or two since, of which your friend "Scripture Dick" was the hero. He was acting as counsel in a suit, the purpose of which was to break the assignment of a Mr. Sherman, of Homer. The counsellor found it pretty hard sledding; he handled the witnesses rather roughly, and made them generally feel as if they would like to catch him alone some day for a few minutes behind the barn. One of the number had made the case, and incidentally Dickinson's behaviour, the subject of conversation as he was riding home one evening, pending the trial, and next day was put upon the stand and questioned as to the purport of his conversation. He told briefly what he had said about the case. The ex-Senator asked what else he had said.

Witness—Nothing else of any consequence.

Dickinson—But what did you say? Let others judge whether it is of consequence.

Witness—I said nothing that has any bearing on this case.

Dickinson—The court, sir, will be able to judge whether your testimony has any bearing upon the case. I wish you to give me the rest of your conversation.

Witness—Why, sir, really I would rather not; it has no bearing upon this case I assure you, and—

Dickinson (rising)—I hope the Court will not permit itself to be trifled with and its time wasted by these manifest evasions. The witness has given a part of his conversation, and refuses to give the remainder. I call upon the Court to compel him to finish it.

The Court—The witness had better repeat all he said that he can remember.

Witness—Well, if I must I will, though I do not see of what use it can be to this trial. I said, sir (*addressing Dickinson*), that you were one of the most ill-mannered and overbearing lawyers, in examining a witness, that I ever put my eyes on, and I said further that you were *a miserable old fogy, and would never be President of the United States.*

Dickinson (trembling all over with indignation, and gesticulating violently)—I appeal to the Court for protection; they have put this man here to insult me!

The fact is, the ex-Senator has not been so badly sold since he invested so largely in flowers for the galleries of the Baltimore Convention in '52. Yours, JENKINS.

—*Correspondence Evening Post.*

MRS. STOWE ON SPIRITUALISM.—In *The Independent* of last week, Harriet Beecher Stowe thus expresses her sentiments upon a warmly controverted subject:

"Nothing about the doom of death is so dreadful as this dead inflexible *silence*. Could there be, after the passage of the river, one backward signal, one last word, the heart would be appeased. There is always something left unsaid even when death has come deliberately and given full warning. How much more when it has fallen like the lightning, and the beloved has been wrenched from life without a parting look or word." "There are those who would have us think that in *our* day there are means which have the power to restore us to the communion of our lost ones. How many a heart, wrung and tortured with the anguish of this fearful silence, has throbbed with strange, vague hopes at the suggestion! When we hear, sometimes, of persons of the strongest and clearest minds becoming credulous votaries of certain spiritualistic circles, let us not wonder. If we inquire, we shall almost always find that the belief has followed some stroke of death—it is only an intensification of the desperation of that heart-hunger which in part it appeases. Ah, *were* it true! were it indeed so that the wall between the spiritual and material is growing thin, and a new dispensation germinating, in which communion with the departed blest shall be among the privileges and possibilities of this our mortal state! Ah, were it so that when we go forth weeping in the gray dawn, bearing spices and odours which we long to pour forth for the beloved dead, we should indeed find the stone rolled away, and an angel sitting on it! But for us the stone must be rolled away by an *unquestionable* angel, whose countenance is as the lightning, who executes no doubtful jiggle by pale moonlight or starlight, but rolls back the stone in fair, open morning, and sits on it. Then we could bless God for his mighty gift, and with love and awe and reverence take up that blessed fellowship with another life, and weave it reverently and trustingly into the web of our daily course. But no such angel have we seen. No such sublime, unquestionable, glorious manifestation. And when we look at what is offered to us, oh, who that had a friend in heaven could wish them to return in such wise as this? The very instinct of a sacred sorrow seems to forbid that our beautiful, our glorified ones should stoop lower than even to the medium of their cast-off bodies to juggle, and rap, and squeak, and perform mountebank tricks with tables and chairs, to recite over in weary sameness harmless truisms which we were wise enough to say for ourselves, to trifle and banter and jest, or to lead us through endless moonshiny mazes; sadly and soberly we say, that if this be communion with the dead, we had rather be without it. We want something a little in advance of our present life, and not below it. We have read with some attention weary pages of spiritual communication professing to come from Bacon, Swedenborg and others, and long accounts from divers spirits of things seen in the spirit-land, and we can conceive of no more appalling prospect than to have them true. If the future life is so weary, stale, flat and unprofitable as we might infer from those readings, one would have reason to deplore an immortality from which no suicide could give an outlet. To be condemned to such eternal prosing would be worse than annihilation."

KIDNAPPING BY A MARYLAND SHERIFF.—On Monday last we gave a full account of the stealing of a free negro from Cecil County jail by the Sheriff of that county, and his subsequent sale in Richmond. Deputy-Marshal Manly, who left for Richmond on Monday morning for the purpose of recovering the boy, if possible, returned this morning, having been successful in his search, and having the boy, George Washington Talbott, in his custody. The Deputy-Marshal has kindly furnished us with an account of his movements during the week. He says that on his arrival in Richmond he found Talbott in the hands of Messrs. Pulliam & Co., slave-dealers, who were about sending him further south; he applied to the firm not only for possession of the boy, but also for the forged papers, which would be necessary in Maryland for a conviction of the parties charged with the abduction; they proposed that if Manly would pay them $150, the sum advanced on Talbott, they would deliver up the papers. In the meantime, a lawyer from Cecil County, named Rowan, made his appearance in Richmond as counsel for Poole and Beatty, and offered the $150 for the papers, but, not having the money to pay down, he was compelled to go back to Elkton for it.

During his absence Marshal Manly did all in his power to get possession of the papers, but without success, Messrs. Pulliam & Co. having sealed them up and handed them over to a lawyer named Murray, who could not be induced to give them up, although notified that the papers were forgeries,

Miscellaneous Department.

For The National Anti-Slavery Standard.

HYMN FOR REFORMERS.

HOLY FATHER! in Thy name,
Caring naught for hate or shame,
Meeting boldly every storm,
We would seek the world's reform:
Bravely may we bear the cross,
Meekly suffer earthly loss;
Patient always in Thy sight,
May we struggle for the right.

While we in Thy strength go forth,
Sowing wide the seeds of truth,
May the Spirit's sun and rain
Quicken all the falling grain:
Heart to heart, and hand to hand,
One in purpose may we stand;
Thus, in holy union strong,
May we vanquish every wrong.

In the dark, tumultuous hour,
When we feel temptation's power,
When the waves of passion rise,
Hear Thou then our anxious cries;
Turn Thou back the swelling tide,
Bid the raging storm subside;
Guide us through the deepest night,
Through the cloud reveal Thy light!

New York, Sept. 1, 1857. O. J.

PATRIOTISM.

AN ORATION

Delivered at Union College, N. Y., July 20; at Dartmouth College, N. H., July 29; at the Normal School Convention, Westfield, Mass., July 31, and at Brown University, R. I., Sept. 3, 1857, by

GEORGE WILLIAM CURTIS.

GENTLEMEN: Day by day, wherever our homes may be in this great land, we have watched the passing pageant of the year. Day by day, from the first quick flush of April, through the deeper green and richer bloom of May and June, we have seen the advancing season develop and increase, until, at last, among roses and golden grain, the year stood perfect in midsummer splendour.

As you have contemplated the brief glory of our Summer, where the clover almost blooms out of snow-drifts and the red apples drop almost with the white blossoms, you have, perhaps, remembered that the flower upon the tree was only the ornament of a moment, a brilliant part of the process by which the fruit was formed, and that the perfect fruit itself was but the seed-vessel by which the race of the tree is continued from year to year.

Then have you followed the exquisite analogy—that youth is the aromatic flower upon the tree—the grave life of maturer years, its sober, solid fruit; and the principles and character deposited by that life, the seeds by which the glory of this race, also, is perpetuated?

I know the flower in your hand fades while you look at it. The dream that allures you glimmers and is gone. But flower and dream, like youth itself, are buds and prophecies. For where, without the perfumed blossoming of the Spring orchards all over the hills and among all the valleys of New England and New York, would the happy harvests of New York and New England be? And where, without the dreams of the young men lighting the future with human possibility, would be the deeds of the old men dignifying the past with human achievement?

Gentlemen, how deeply does it become us to believe it who are not only young ourselves, but living with the youth of the youngest nation in history.

I congratulate you that you are young; I congratulate you that you are Americans. Like you, that country is in its flower, not yet in its fruit; and that flower is subject to a thousand chances before the fruit is set. Worms may destroy it; frosts may wither it; fires may blight it; gusts may whirl it away. But how gorgeously it still hangs blossoming in the garden of time, while its penetrating perfume floats all round the world, and intoxicates all other nations with the hope of Liberty.

Knowing that the life of every nation, as of each individual, is a battle, let us remember also that the battle is to those who fight with faith and undespairing devotion. Knowing that nothing is worth fighting for at all unless God reigns, let us at least believe as much in the goodness of God as we do in the dexterity of the devil. And viewing this prodigious spectacle of our country—this hope of humanity, this Young America, *our* America, taking the sun full in its front, and making for the future as boldly and blithely as the young David for Goliath—let us believe with all our hearts—and from that faith shall spring the fact, that David and not Goliath is to win the day, and that out of the high-hearted dreams of wise and good men about our country, Time, however invisibly and inscrutably, is at this moment slowly hewing the most colossal and resplendent result in history.

I am not unmindful of the occasion. I do not forget the ideal consecration of the college to good letters and good morals. I remember that our college system, continued, with great modifications, from that of England, was there founded by monks. I recall, with a delight that will surely last with life, the pensive seclusion of monastic cloisters, "the tall trees of Christ's, the groves of Magdalen, the shadow of the mighty Bodley," and the memory of the mightier men who walked there; and I reflect that the cloister to a nobleman was not a comfortable bed in which he was tucked up from trouble, to rehearse death in sleep, but the chapel in which he knelt all night in prayer, until the moment when the voice should say to him, "Go forth! Be brave, be loyal, be triumphant." A monk is a denizen of the cloisters: a man is a citizen of the world. I shall speak to you as men, not as monks.

> "I like a church, I like a cowl,
> I love a prophet of the soul;
> And on my heart monastic aisles
> Fall like sweet strains or pensive smiles;
> Yet not for all his faith can see
> Would I that cowled churchman be.
> * * * * *
> "The word unto the prophet spoken
> Was writ on tables yet unbroken;
> The word by seers or sybils told,
> In groves of oak or fanes of gold,
> Still floats upon the morning wind,
> Still whispers to the willing mind."

Is the name of Greece choice and poetic in our ears, and do we wish that the name of America shall be as much dearer to the human heart as a man is better than the statue of a man? Do we believe that the genius of America will make the hope of America a reality?

Then that result can be accomplished only by a profound faith in that genius; only by the religious resolution of every successive generation of young Americans that the great ideas out of which America sprang, the cardinal principle of civil and religious liberty, shall still guide the development of its destiny.

To-day, therefore, let us turn no black-letter lore. Scholars do not need to hear of the value of scholarship. The finest scholarship is but a single grace of the *man*. How can the *man* best be developed in America? That is a question to which the Future bends its ear. Let us, then, look at the tie which binds us to that country, and consider the nature, responsibility and duties of Patriotism.

It was not his olive valleys and almond groves which made the Greece of the Greek. It was not for his apple-orchards or potato-fields that the farmer of New England and New York left his plough in the furrow and marched to Bunker Hill, to Bennington, to Saratoga. The rains fall, the earth yields, fruits ripen, and the world is fair, whether George is King, or James is President; whether armies are marching to shoot and slay, or troops of children laugh in the meadows, picking butter-cups and daisies.

When we speak of Greece, our chief interest is not in a certain number of square miles of ground, so much water, so many trees—it is not geographical, or botanical, or geological; but it is in our association with the history of a people and a certain character that we call Greek. So with the French, the Italian, the German and the English. But these qualities, although marking distinctly these races, are not theirs exclusively; they belong to human nature at large.

It is the same with personal traits. The Italian complexion is brunette, but the blonde Lucrezia Borgia was an Italian; and the Greeks had straight noses, but Socrates was a Greek; and from the coarse grain of animal nature the English are personified as John Bull, but Shakspeare was an Englishman.

National characteristics are thus neither absolute nor invariable differences. But just as the individuals of particular nations have a general resemblance to each other, so have all the nations themselves; and as the dividing line between Italy and Germany is a purely arbitrary division, and for many miles upon each side of it the inhabitants are homogeneous; as Swabia and Saxony and Hanover are imperfectly separated from each other, yet all make one Germany together, so national characteristics continually blend and mingle, and gradually lead us to the reflection that, as the substance of the globe upon which we live and the substance of human bodies are at last the same, so the races are but one race; human nature is everywhere endowed with the same rights and duties; and thus Christianity, or the doctrine and practice of universal brotherhood, becomes simply the ethical statement of a scientific fact.

In whatever country or of whatever race a man may chance to be born, he is born a citizen of the world, and bound by the universal rule of right or law of God. God writes that law upon the man's perceptions, and we call it conscience, or God in him. Proper manhood is the fruit of obedience to that law. Countries and families are but nurseries and influences. A man is a father, a brother, a son; a German, a Roman, an American; but beneath all these relations he is a man. The end of his human destiny is surely not to be the best German, or the best Roman, or the best father, but the best man he can be. Whether in Crim Tartary or Patagonia, his first duty is to know the will of God and to do it.

History shows us that this association of men in various nations is made subservient to the gradual advance an advantage of the whole human race; and that all nations work together toward one grand result. So, to the philosophic eye, the race is but a vast caravan forever moving, but seeming often to encamp for centuries, to halt at some green oasis of ease, where the siren luxury lures away heroism, as soft Capua enervated the hosts of Hannibal. But still the march proceeds, slowly, slowly, over mountains, through valleys, along plains, marking its course with monumental splendours; cities, arts, literatures, histories; with wars, plagues, murders, private selfishness and public crime; advancing still, decorated with all the pomp of nature, counselled by the seasons, lit by the constellations, cheered by the future, warned by the past. In that vast march the van forgets the rear, the individual is lost, and yet the multitude is but many individuals; he faints, and falls, and dies, his heart wavers, his hope expires; man is forgotten, but still mankind moves on, still worlds revolve, and the will of God is done in earth and Heaven.

Viewing its tragic steps, we must not wonder that men have gravely asked if the race were not utterly lost. Nature mocks us, they say. A rose is perfect. No imagination of a rose could change it, but man, the darling of creation for whom roses blow, and stars shine, and the spheres sing—man, the tenant of time and heir of eternity, lies, cheats, steals, repeats to-day the crime, and mumbles to-morrow the excuse, of yesterday, satisfied to be no meaner than other men, to live without friction and die without faith.

Thus human history seems but a series of wars and intrigues. Our best literature, Shakspeare, Dante, Goethe, Bacon, Fenelon, is a sigh, a sermon, a satire or a dream, and art instinctively seeks the ideal or possible, instead of the real or actual humanity. The survey breeds a hopeless skepticism, or a more disastrous sophistry. Seeing the ignorance, the war, the pestilence, the slavery, men ask, "Is it not inevitable? Did not God permit it all? If we do the wrong, will He not work it to the right, and, in any event, if the crime is to be done, must not somebody be the criminal?"

And so we have Malthusian theories and prayers to the God of battles, and gildings and glozings of piracy and robbery and slavery. But over all thunders the still unworn and mysterious curse, "It must needs be that offences come, but wo to him by whom the offence cometh!"

Now, precisely as a man hopes individually to help make the world and history smile, so he hopes the same of his family and his country.

Patriotism, or the peculiar relation of an individual to his country, is like the family instinct. In the child it is a blind devotion, in the man an intelligent love. The patriot perceives the claim made upon his country, by the circumstances and time of her growth and power, and how God is to be served by using those opportunities of helping mankind. Therefore his country's honour is dear to him as his own; and he would as soon lie and steal himself as assist or excuse his country in a crime. Just in the degree that a son is fond and affectionate, does he not break his heart over his mother's shame? A mother's sin is not a virtue because your mother is the sinner. Because you love your brother and would die for him, will you hold a man's throat while your brother picks his pocket?

Right and Wrong, Justice and Crime, exist independently of our country. A public wrong is not a private right for any citizen. The citizen is a man bound to know and to do the right, and the nation is but an aggregation of citizens. If a man should shout in the delirium of dinner, "My country, by whatever means extended and bounded; my country, right or wrong," he merely repeats the words of the thief who steals in the street, or of the trader who swears falsely at the Custom House, both of them chuckling, "My fortune, however acquired."

Thus, gentlemen, we see that a man's country is not a certain area of land—of mountains, rivers and woods—but it is a principle; and patriotism is loyalty to that principle.

In poetic minds and in popular enthusiasm this feeling becomes closely associated with the soil and symbols of the country. But the secret sanctification of the soil and the symbol is the idea which they represent, and this idea the patriot worships through the name and the symbol, as a lover kisses with rapture the glove of his mistress and wears a lock of her hair upon his heart.

So, with passionate heroism, of which tradition is never weary of tenderly telling, Arnold von Winklereid gathers into his bosom the sheaf of foreign spears, that his death may give life to his country. So Nathan Hale, disdaining no service that his country demands, perishes untimely, with no other friend than God and the satisfied sense of duty. So George Washington, at once comprehending the scope of the destiny to which his country was devoted, with one hand puts aside the crown and with the other sets his slaves free. So, through all history from the beginning, a noble army of martyrs has fought fiercely and fallen bravely for that unseen mistress, their Country. So, through all history to the end, as long as men believe in God, that army must still march and fight and fall—recruited only from the flower of mankind—cheered only by their own hope of humanity—strong only in their confidence in their cause.

Yet, through all the ages of the combat, the mistress, beloved as of human affection—of whom poets sung, for whom heroes died—is still unseen and her voice unheard. But, in some happy hour of the bivouac, the musing soldier hears hum of cities and inland mills—sees golden harvest waving out of sight—sees men and women walking and working, parents and children of Freedom, and bending over all the benediction of the Summer sky; and the musing soldier of that great army, in the harvest and murmur, knows that he sees and hears, as they only can be seen and heard, the face and the voice of the mistress he loves and worships.

II. If such is Patriotism in general, what is it in particular? How can you, as educated young Americans, best serve the great cause of human development to which all nationalities are subservient?

In the Life of Columbus we read that, after being many weeks at sea, the great navigator was at open defiance with his crew; but one day, after the vesper hymn to the Virgin had been sung, Columbus pointed out to the sailors the goodness of God in wafting them over a tranquil ocean, and holding out to them promises of land.

"As the evening darkened," says the charming chronicler, who, himself the patriarch of American literature, has written with tender fidelity the lives of the two most famous men associated with the history of America—Columbus, who discovered the theatre of the historical experiment, and Washington, who secured its honest trial—and has thereby linked to those great names another, which I do not need to mention, for your hearts go before my lips to name Washington Irving—"as the evening darkened, Columbus took his station on the top of the castle or cabin, on the high poop of his vessel, ranging his eye along the dusky horizon, and maintaining an intense and unremitting watch. About 10 o'clock, he thought he beheld a light glimmering at a great distance. Fearing his eager hopes might deceive him, he called to Pedro Guiterez, Gentleman of the King's Bedchamber, and inquired if he saw such a light; the latter replied in the affirmative. Doubtful whether it might not yet be some delusion of the fancy, Columbus called Rodrigo Sanchez of Segovia, and made the same inquiry. By the time the latter had descended the round-house the light had disappeared. They saw it once or twice afterward in sudden and passing gleams, as if it were a torch in the bark of a fisherman, rising and sinking in the waves, or in the hand of some person on shore, borne up and down as he walked from house to house. So transient and uncertain were these gleams that few attached any importance to them. Columbus, however, considered them as certain signs of land; and, moreover, that the land was inhabited."

So, out of dancing waves, trembling and uncertain rose the natal star of our continent; so, as in the old Greek fable of Venus, love and beauty arose from purity, emerged a new world into history; so, as that world was destined to light the wandering nations to liberty, it first appeared as a harbinger of hope to weary mariners—a light upon the shores, a ray in the darkness—may I not say, without irreverence, that since the shepherds followed the heavenly beacon to the manger where the infant lay, no star so sacred has risen in the sky as the glimmering light that showed Columbus he had reached the continent in which the future of the world reposed.

The collected civilization of the world before the fifteenth century was but a various development of the principle of absolutism in human affairs. The State was the corollary of the Church. The new continent seems to have been reserved by Providence in virgin seclusion for the development of the other great principle, of freedom or human liberty. Mankind had begun to outgrow the idea of political and religious slavery, and a revolution was breeding, as deep as the human soul and as dear as its interests.

A century before the discovery of America, Wickliffe had declared that a bad man could not be a good spiritual guide merely because he was a priest; and, that bad men might not be the sole interpreters of the Good Book, he translated the Bible into the language of the common people; and so seemingly ripe were the people that it was said you could not meet two men talking in the street but one was a Wickliffeite.

Half a century after Wickliffe came the invention of printing, which was to make his translation accessible to the people; and nearly half a century later Columbus discovered America, and Martin Luther was nine years old.

But the new continent was not to become at once the theatre of the new principle. On the contrary, it is curious to observe that Columbus sailed only for a shorter way to the Indies, and hoped, perhaps, that the light he saw flickering across the waves might prove at morning to have shone from some stately palace of Cathay. In the spirit of his voyage came those who followed him. The enterprise had been aimed at India or El Dorado for the sake of gold, and the Spaniards, who benefited by the discovery, sought only the same object.

It is curious, also, to observe that the part of the continent first touched was the most tropical and luxuriant, requiring the least labour to cultivate, and hiding the most precious metals. Allured by the charm of climate and the promise of wealth, swarms of adventurers crossed the sea. The lust of gold never begot so sickening a spectacle as that of the American Indies in those earlier days. Outraging all divine and human laws, the life of those adventurers was an orgie, a fierce debauch.

The Bishop Las Casas, shocked by the crimes against the inoffensive Indians, and stupified with the sophistry of a Church that has always had that half of the apostolic character which consists in the wisdom of the serpent, advised the enslaving of negroes, who were a stronger race, and might by compulsory slavery be won to the service of a God who is Love and Liberty. This was the culmination of the crimes against humanity which marked the early settlements in America. And it is dreadful to remember that the curse which has withered millions of our fellow-men upon this continent, and which at this moment seems to be the chief serious obstacle to the triumph of the process for which the continent was reserved, can be traced back to the suggestion of one man, and he a Christian Bishop.

But let us never forget, in extenuation of this enormous crime, that Las Casas was a Spanish Roman Catholic, living more than three centuries ago, in the midst of the horrors of the early West Indian struggle for gold, and that he lived to deplore bitterly the course he had advised, having learned, as three centuries have continued to learn, that to do a great and evident wrong for the sake of a possible good is only to make sure of committing the sin and to leave the good worse than undone. And I am sure no candid young mind will hear without incredulity and shame that the repented error of Las Casas, three hundred years ago, is the last desperate defence of a system in the land where he planted it, which the holy indignation of humanity is slowly but surely withering; for if we grant with reverence that God brings good out of evil, shall we therefore, with Jesuitical sophistry, consent to do the evil?

It seemed, certainly, at the beginning of the seventeenth century, as if the discovery of the new continent had only made the world richer to make it worse. The new settlements merely repeated in more hideous forms the vices of the old European civilization. But the kind climate, the quick soil and the rare metals, by attracting adventurers, had done their work. The lost Atlantis had been found again. Sebastian Cabot, Cabral, Cortereal, Verrazzani, Cartier, in many latitudes, under every auspice, had touched the remote and fabulous shores. Among the sunset clouds a new continent lay fallow for the future, waiting to be possessed and inhabited by any people who had sufficient cause, and heart and hope enough to subdue it.

The movement for whose ultimate purposes the scene was thus preparing, still went on in Europe. Wickliffe had translated the Bible into English; Luther translated the New Testament into German; and while Charles V. issued a rescript against "the fool," "the blasphemer," "the fiend in human form," Martin Luther defied Popes, Emperors, and as many devils as there were tiles upon the house tops, and with the Pope's bull of excommunication kindled the immortal fire that was to blaze brighter as it crossed the sea; until the little wavering flame of human liberty thickening in Wittenberg was to burst, like day, on the new land, and blaze there, ever higher and higher, until it became the universal light of the world.

The reckless cavaliers of Spain landed in the tropics for a life of luxury, and they made no permanent impression upon this continent except of sorrow and misery. The controlling settlement of the country was delayed until the sad, severe children of Luther's spirit, for whom in the Divine order this land was kept, came praying across a wintry sea, and landed on its gloomiest shore.

> "Not as the conqueror comes,
> They, the true-hearted, came;
> Not with the roll of stirring drums,
> And the trumpet that sings of fame.
>
> "Not as the flying come,
> In silence and in fear—
> They shook the depths of the desert gloom,
> With their hymns of lofty cheer.
>
> "Amid the storm they sang,
> And the stars heard and the sea,
> And the sounding aisles of the dim wood rang
> To the anthems of the free."

From this love of liberty, and from what is rarer, the ability of organizing liberty in human institutions, sprang the America of which we are so fondly proud. Our popular or democratic idea has this profound difference from the same thought as it has appeared in Greece, or the Republics of the middle ages—that it is associated with the Religious instinct; so that our political has always rested upon our religious liberty. American civilization, in its idea, is historically the political aspect of the Reformation. America is a permanent protest against the principle of Absolutism; it offers freedom to feudalism—liberty to slavery. Democracy is the declaration of a brotherhood of rights—and, therefore, with a sublime propriety, forecasting its destiny and duty, the first articulate words of America were: "All men are born free and equal"—the echo in the mouths of legislators and the hearts of a people, of the song the Syrian shepherds heard from celestial singers, "Peace on earth, good will to men."

Now, as I conceive it, gentlemen, patriotism in an American is simply fidelity to the American idea. Our Government was established confessedly in obedience to this sentiment of human liberty. We are satisfied that the republican or democratic form, upon the whole, best serves the interest of mankind; but quite as much from the consideration that men are too bad to be trusted with despotic individual power as from the conviction that they are so good that their collective will must needs be right. And it may well be asked whether a Democracy is not an educative rather than a final form of government—a process which shall improve all men, so that a few may safely be made rulers. For it is a conspicuous fact in history that Democracies have never displayed a progressive power of organization and development. They proclaimed the popular theory, and rested there—and the popular governments rotted back into despotisms.

The ultimate object of government is not the regulation of trade and the prevention of crime, but the development of the race. A good government is not symbolized by a system of police, but by a process of nature; and he is not the best citizen who informs when laws have been broken, but he who interests himself that only such laws are made as ought to be obeyed. And your duty as patriots is to understand clearly that, by all its antecedents, your country is consecrated to the cause of Freedom; that it was discovered when the great principle of Human Liberty was about to be organized into human institutions; that it was settled by men who were exiled by reason of their loyalty to that principle; that it separated politically from its mother country because that principle had been assailed; and it began its peculiar existence by formally declaring its faith in Human Freedom and Equality; and, therefore, that whatever in its government or policy tends to limit or destroy that freedom and equality is anti-American and unpatriotic, because America and Liberty are inseparable ideas.

Doubtless, in every civilized and intelligent society there is no need of saying that the public laws must be obeyed. But the rule is subject to a very grave exception. The name of law has always been the glove, muffled in which tyranny has taken liberty by the throat.

You have no right to sophisticate your minds. You are not to suppose that a law is, under all circumstances, to be obeyed; you would be poor children of seven years' armed disobedience to laws if you believed that. A civilized and intelligent society obeys the law. When the law begins to grind, that community changes it, if it makes its own laws, or protests if it does not. If protest is of no avail, and the law still grinds, the community changes the lawmakers at whatever cost of time, and money, and blood.

You have heard it a thousand times; it is a Fourth of July oration. But we must go one step further, to the issue upon which, so far as we can see, the whole future of the race depends. In the world upon which you are entering, you will be told that with us all excuse for disobedience is removed, because we can so easily and often change the laws; that if Charles I. had really summoned the whole people of England to a parliament, and had executed their will, Cromwell and Hampden would have had no reason; that if the American colonies had been fairly represented, Washington would have been a mere rebel.

But, gentlemen, amid the jargon of corrupt politics, and the shivering sophistries of timidity and indifference and ease, which blow upon every generation of young hearts, as the suffocating sirocco blows over springing grain, remember steadily that laws are of two kinds—those which concern us as citizens, and those which affect us as men. We are born men, with certain indefeasible moral duties, whether our birth chance in China or New England; and we are born citizens, with certain obligations to the law. If, therefore, the law of the land, enacted by a majority of the people, declares that you must pay a heavy tax—that a railroad may pierce your garden—that a duty may be levied on the goods you import—however injurious the effect may be, you can have no right to resist forcibly, because the consequences of forcible resistance would be universal confusion and injury, and because, if it be found to be a grievance by the majority, they will presently put it right, and, meanwhile your pecuniary loss is your share of the compromise for the general security. These are laws that concern us only as citizens in our relations to the State. In themselves, they have no moral character of importance.

But if the law of the land, enacted by the majority, or by any other authority, declares that you must murder your child under two years of age, or prostitute your daughter, or deny a cup of water to the thirsty, or return to savage Indians an innocent captive flying for his life, whom they had stolen from his country, and enslaved for their own gain, under the name of civilizing him, you have no right to obey, because such laws nullify themselves, being repulsive to the holiest human instincts, and obedience to them would produce a more disastrous public demoralization than any possible revolution could breed. "To authorize an untruth by a toleration of State," said the Cobbler of Agawam, one of the stern old Puritans, two hundred and seventeen years ago, "is to build a sconce against the walls of heaven, to batter God out of his chair." Such laws God and man require of you to disobey, for upon a people who, under any pretence, could yield to them, there is no tyranny so terrible that it might not be imposed.

Will you obey, under the plea that it is law, and that you have no right to judge the law, but must try and alter it by and by? By and by? But God is God to-day, and to-day a child is born to you; he is under two years old; to-day the thirsty wretch falls parched and panting at your feet; to-day the captive from those Indians red as murder crouches on your hearth-stone, and the law is knocking at your door: "Give me that child, give me that thirsty wretch, give me that frightened fugitive: I am the law!" Yes, and God is knocking at your heart: "Whosoever doeth it unto the least of these my brethren, doeth it unto me!"

If we believe that our country embodies any principle, that it is peopled for another purpose than the early Spaniards peopled it, and that as moral agents and self-respecting men we have something to do in America beside turning the air and water and earth into wealth, we shall need to cling to no principle so strongly as this: that no possible law can bind us to do a moral wrong. All other inconveniences and disadvantages we may suffer for the sake of law, seeing how soon the injury may be repaired; but there is no reparation of moral injury. What excuse is it for my lying, and thieving, and murdering—for my trampling upon conscience, which is God in me, that the law ordered it? It is the ecstacy of atheism. Whenever this nation shall say it, original barbarism lapses upon the land; the work of Wickliffe, and Luther, and all history, is undone, and the hope of the world is betrayed. Can conscience wait, and humanity wait, and duty wait? Can the rose delay blooming, or the day dawning, or the child its birth?

I should be sorry to seem unmindful of the scope of what I say. I do not think I am. I think, and you think with me, that if there were ever a doubt of the happy duration of this Government, it is in the days that are passing; and because there is now a deadly debate in our minds whether men may not do wrong for the sake of some apparent advantage.

Will you ask where we should be if every citizen is to decide for himself whether he is to obey the law? On the other hand, I ask you where we shall be if he is not? If he consent to act against his moral judgment for a year, for two years, for six months, for a week, do you not see that his entire moral nature is corrupted—that such a man, upon the very same ground, would deny his father, would sell his sister, if the law required; and that to believe the interests of mankind committed to a nation of such men, is to accuse not only the goodness, but the wisdom of God?

Besides; whenever, in a country like ours, such a law chances to exist, it is the will of the majority, and they will punish the disobedient. To that punishment the offender will willingly submit, and thereby show homage to the principle of law. But when good men are sent to jail for refusing to do wrong, if there be any public conscience, there will soon be a change. James II. sent the Bishops to the tower, but to put them in the tower was not to put them in the wrong, and, after a little while, the people of England drove James II. across the sea.

Nor need you fear that men will plead their conscience falsely to avoid obedience to the law; because the penalty is always proportioned and always exacted. And if a man says, to escape payment of a tax, that his moral sense will not allow him to pay, his tax will be doubled or trebled in the shape of penalty.

The whole of patriotism for us seems to consist, at the present moment, in the maintenance of this public moral tone. No noise of self-glorification, no complacent congratulation that we are the greatest, wisest and best of nations, will help our greatness or our goodness in the smallest degree. History and mankind do not take men or nations at their own valuation, and a man no longer secures instant respect and sympathy by announcing himself an American. We raised twelve hundred millions of pounds of cotton last year! Did we, indeed! And, also, during the last year, we allowed our brothers and friends and fellow-citizens to be cruelly murdered for doing precisely the same thing that we this year build statues on Bunker Hill to men for doing eighty years ago. Are we satisfied that America should have no other excuse for independent national existence than a superior facility of money-making? Shall it have no national justification to the intellect and the heart? Does the production of twelve hundred million pounds of cotton fulfil the destiny of this continent in the order of Providence? Why, though our population were to double in a year, and the roar and rush of our vast machinery were to silence the music of the spheres, and our wealth were enough to buy all the world, our population could not bully history, nor all our riches bribe the eternal Justice not to write upon our brows, as with fiery finger the Autumn is beginning even now to write upon the woods and fields, "Ichabod! Ichabod! thy glory is departed!"

There is occasion enough for reminding you of the solemn necessity of this public morality, because it is upon the class you represent—upon the educated and intelligent men of this country—that its just development depends. The theory of our government is that the masses govern. Strictly speaking, this is never true, except in those rare instances where masses of men act under the inspiration of a moral sentiment. In this country the masses vote; but a few men govern. There is a power behind the throne; so, behind the convention there is a caucus; in the caucus there is a clique, and the clique is controlled by personal influence. Masses of men are the hundred hands of Briareus—but the hands are only a hundred servants of one brain. As the elemental forces which could cleave the earth are but the supple servants of science, so human action, which makes history, is the willing minister of genius or intellectual power. Here is our popular republic, tossing through time in ceaseless agitation, smiting a barrier now here, now there, with an overwhelming force, as the sea crushes obstacles with a towering ninth wave; but, whether working good or ill, that tossing myriad of men never loses for a moment its instinctive loyalty to intellectual superiority. Even so the ocean—thundering with wrath on continental shores, or rising with soft flood up inlet, creek and bay, its oozy fingers touching all the banks with fruitfulness and bloom—whether wrinkling the globe with billows or sheeting it with silver calm, is not lawless in its coyest motion, but yields forever to the superb and irresistible persuasion of the moon.

Have we no interest that that controlling force in this country shall be a moral force?—that it shall conspire with the great idea of Liberty, and not degrade and destroy it? The theory of our institutions is our pride. But it is a pitiful truth that our public life has become synonymous with knavery. If a politician is introduced, you feel of your pockets. It is shameful that it is universally conceded that the best men, the men of intelligence and probity, generally avoid politics, and that the word itself has come to mean something not to be touched without defilement. Consequently, what good men will not touch bad men will. It is understood that bribery carries the election; and the Presidency is the result of an adroit process of financial engineering. I have myself been shown a handful of bank notes, publicly displayed in the ante-room of a Legislature, and sagaciously told: "That is the logic for legislators." Men think they cannot afford to go to Congress, and they pay other men to do their duties to the State—forgetting that we can have nothing without paying for it, and that if we hope to enjoy the best government in the world we must pay time and labour, each one of us, and not suppose that the country will govern itself, nor bad men govern it well.

Remember that the greatness of our country is not in its achievement, but in its promise—a promise which cannot be fulfilled without that sovereign moral sense—without a sensitive national conscience. If it were a question of the mere daily pleasure of living, the gratification of taste, opportunity of access to the great intellectual and esthetic results of human genius, and whatever embellishes human life, no man could hesitate a moment between the fulness of foreign lands in these respects and the conspicuous poverty of our own. What have we done? We have subdued and settled a vast domain; we have made every inland river turn a mill; and wherever, on the dim rim of the globe, there is a harbour, we have lighted it with an American sail. We have bound the Atlantic to the Mississippi so that we drift from the sea to the prairies upon a cloud of vapour; and we are stretching one hand across the continent to fulfil the hope of Columbus in a shorter way to Cathay, and with the other we are grasping under the sea to clasp the hand of the old continent, that so the throbbing of the ocean may not toss us further apart, but be as the beating of one common pulse of the world.

Yet these are results common to all national enterprise, and different with us only in degree, not in kind. These are but the tools with which to shape a destiny. Commercial prosperity is only a curse, if it be not subservient to moral and intellectual progress; and our prosperity will conquer us, if we do not conquer our prosperity.

You will find that our commercial success has made us all cowards. It is a question whether even a greater issue than that of the Revolution could rouse us to our fathers' heroism. We are a morally pusillanimous people. We claim, for instance, to be founded upon the idea of human liberty and progress; yet we do not dare to discuss slavery; but we shiver, and run round, and duck, and dodge, and shirk, and apologize; and if a man rises quietly, as Channing did, and says, "Let us ask not what is expedient, but what is right," or if any man of ordinary common sense says that a nation which professes to be the peculiar representative of human freedom ought not to be the only illustration among civilized nations of human slavery, instead of granting the truth, as we do that twice two are four, and trying to set ourselves right before God and man, we pray now to good God, now to good devil, and wonder which is going to carry us off, after all.

Gentlemen, you will not be surprised when you discover, as you soon will, that, notwithstanding the commercial prosperity of our country, there are wise men who shake their heads already, and good men who despair.

But I am not here to counsel you to despair and headshakings. I am here to say that this country, which you are to inherit and for which you are to be responsible, needs only an enlightened patriotism to fulfil all its mission. I do not believe that our young energy is capable of nothing more than money-making at any cost—at any wear and tear of the moral sense. I do not believe the continent, veiled and virgin through all the debaucheries of early history, was unveiled only to be wedded to the same spirit, grown rank and old. I do not believe that the purpose of God, in the progress of the race to self-respecting and consistent Liberty and Law, is to be thwarted by moral cowardice. But I believe, rather, that there is a moral sentiment in the country which will make the glooms of its morning the glories of its prime, and which honours the name American so much that it would willingly die rather than see it desecrated. In a system of popular education by which our people have an unprecedented general intelligence—in a free Press, and generally the freest public discussion—in the entire separation of Church and State, and absolute religious toleration—in a system of government which constantly refers the legislators to a people already free and educated, and so far inclined to wise counsel—we have all the means men could ask in human society to coöperate with Providence, and incarnate the American idea in a nation which shall be worthy its advantages.

Young Americans! those means are yours. Use them as God inspires. Be faithful, be firm, be bold—neither deluded by the hope of easy success nor disheartened by the long delay. We shall die, and our children's children, and yet the end not be. But be cheered by the great aim and by the great spirit in which you serve it. Live to justify your own hope and the vision of all noble minds, and your memory then will cheer the hope of humanity, as, after sunset, the dew revives the world.

ORIGINAL LETTER FROM JOHN QUINCY ADAMS.

THE following deeply interesting letter has been set up directly from the original in the hand-writing of John Quincy Adams. It was bought by a Philadelphian, at auction, in London, last summer. We can hardly believe that so long and interesting a letter from this great man could have existed such a length of time without having been in print; but, so far as our actual knowledge goes, this is its first public appearance. Every one, however, will be gratified to read so pleasant a letter (knowing how directly it is *here* offered), even if it may have been met with before.—*Philadelphia Bizarre.*

The Rev'd Bernard Whitman, Waltham:

WASHINGTON, 13 Nov'r., 1833.

DEAR SIR: I received at Boston, on my way to this city, your letter of the 4th inst., which I very cheerfully answer to the best of my information and belief.

In the year 1779, in the midst of the war of the American Revolution, my father was sent by Congress to Europe with a commission for negotiating peace with Great Britain. He embarked at Boston, in the French frigate "La Sensible," bound to Brest. On her passage she sprung aleak, which compelled her to make for the first European port, and my father landed from her at Ferrol, in Spain. He travelled thence to France by land, and was everywhere treated by the Spaniards with great kindness and distinction. At one of the cities through which he passed, Leon or Astorga, there was a magnificent cathedral church, which he visited as an object of curiosity. He was conducted by the Archbishop himself, a man of elegant and polished manners, over his apartments, furnished with the splendour of a Royal Palace; and he caused to be exhibited to him the more precious, though less costly, *relics* belonging to the Church. Upon the exposition of one of these by the priest in whose custody they were, the Archbishop and every other person of the Catholic communion present bowed their heads and made, with the fore-finger of the right hand directed to their own foreheads, the sign of the Cross. The keeper of the relics, perceiving that my father did not join in this act of devotion, turned pale, and, looking at my father with intense earnestness, said in French—"Est ce que Monsieur n'est pas Chretien?" (Is the gentleman not a Christian?) The Archbishop, without waiting for my father's answer, instantly said, smiling—"Oui à sa manière" (yes; after his own manner), with which the priest, seeing that his archbishop was satisfied, was also satisfied, or at least silenced, himself.

What liberties Miss Fanny Wright that was (but who, I have heard, has been constrained by the unrelenting tyranny of the world to change her name and legitimate her child by a downright lawful marriage), what liberties she, in her *maiden* purity, may have taken with the name of my father, by citing *him* as one of the votaries of *her* creed of infidelity, I do not know, though I had heard, before receiving your letter, that she had made more free with it than she had or could have any warrant for doing. My father was not an infidel after the manner of Miss Fanny Wright. But to the question whether he was a *Christian*, the only answer that I can give at this day is that with which the sound sense and *true* Christian spirit of the Spanish Archbishop quieted his inquisitive subordinate—"Yes—after his own manner."

My father's father was a rigid Calvinist, of the straitest sect of those days, and a perfectly honest man. He was a deacon of the First Congregational Church in Braintree; and, although a poor man, prevailed upon my father to go to college, against his inclination, with the view of fitting him for the ministry. My grandfather's elder brother had been so fitted, by *his* father, and was minister of the church at Newington, New Hampshire, more than sixty years. My father went through college, destined by the hopes of his father and his own intentions to the Christian ministry of the Congregational Church, as then existing in New England.

He persisted in this intention about one year after he left college, and while keeping school at Worcester. He then renounced that purpose and devoted himself to the study and practice of the law, from a conscientious conviction that he could not believe or honestly preach the Calvinistic doctrines, and from a knowledge, dearly bought, that no other doctrines would then be tolerated in any of the pulpits to which he might be called. He changed his projected profession for the express purpose of preserving the *independence* of his religious opinions.

He was, so far as I know, to the last moment of his life, a Christian, in all that he deemed to be the essentials of Christianity. He was from an early period of his life a member of the Congregational Church, of which his father had been a deacon—an intimate and confidential friend of Doctors Mayhew and Cooper, his cotemporaries at Boston. A constant attendant upon divine worship, not only at home, but wherever an opportunity could be afforded him abroad—a parishioner and familiar friend of Dr. Archibald M'Laine, the translator of Mosheim, at the Hague, of Dr. Richard Price, at Hackney, near London—he was equally the friend of Mr. Wibert, and of Mr. Whitney, the successive ministers of the church at Quincy, to which he belonged, the latter of whom performed the last services of religion over his remains.

He was through life a religious and a pious Christian. He believed Christianity to be the best system of *morals* that has ever been inculcated upon man, and he venerated its founder. But he had no faith in *creeds*. He did not believe in Transubstantiation—in the Trinity—in the Godhead of Jesus—nor in the Atonement, as preached by the Calvinistic Divines. He not only rejected those doctrines, but had an aversion to them, believing them positively pernicious. He had read much of the rankest infidelity, but was no convert to Bolingbroke, Diderot or Voltaire—nor to the Marquis D'Argene, Mirabeau, or Deguis—and he detested the irreligion of Tom Paine, not less than his politics.

The different sects of Christianity have not yet sufficiently learnt the lesson of toleraton for each other's opinions to agree upon the definition of the term which embraces them all. I know not how many of those sects there are, who, for the heresies of my father would denominate him an infidel—probably a large majority of the *numbers* who acknowledged themselves disciples of the Christian faith. The whole of the Greek and Latin Churches, the greater part of Lutheran and Church of England Episcopalians, and all the Calvinistic Churches, would too probably concur with Miss Fanny Wright in pronouncing my father an infidel. If, in the wisdom